
FIDE ET VIRTUTE
CANCELLED
W. E. Gladstone
St. Deiniol's Library
Hawarden, Clwyd
Founded by
The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone

E 13/84

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/anglicanessays0000vari

61384

ANGLICAN ESSAYS

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

GLADSTONE'S LIBRARY,
HAWARDEN.

ANGLICAN ESSAYS.

A COLLECTIVE REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPLES AND SPECIAL OPPORTUNITIES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AS CATHOLIC AND REFORMED

BY

THE ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH
THE REV. R. H. MURRAY
G. G. COULTON
THE ARCHDEACON OF CHESTER (EDITOR)
THE ARCHDEACON OF MACCLESFIELD
THE REV. CHARLES E. RAVEN
ARCHBISHOP LOWTHER CLARKE

WITH EXTRACTS FROM THE PASTORALS OF
THE LATE BISHOP JAYNE

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1923

COPYRIGHT

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

At a time when all human things are in a state of solution, it is not surprising that the Anglican Church should be showing many signs of unrest and change. Her position in the Christian world is essentially central. Impatient spirits may dislike the *via media* and seek other paths, but it remains true that, like every art, the art of life is most perfectly practised by those who follow the golden rule of moderation. If there is anything our age needs it is the re-discovery of the old Greek principle of *μηδὲν ἄγαν*—nothing in excess. It is an age of shrieking partisans, and of revolutionaries who are prepared to destroy everything in the hope that something else may turn up. At such a time an institution which steadfastly holds the middle path is of inestimable value to mankind.

In spite of certain causes of apprehension, there are two signs which indicate that the Anglican Church is not likely to depart from the course which her history and genius have marked out for her. First, the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and especially the "Appeal to all Christian People," dealing with the subject of reunion, show that the Episcopate of the whole Communion is not only true to the great Anglican tradition but is also seeking to promote the unity of Christendom by taking full advantage of the central position of their Church. It is not too much to say that never before in the history of Anglicanism was the value of its mediating position so evident.

Secondly, it is to be observed that, while one very

active party is seeking to draw the Church towards mediaevalism, there is an equally active, though not perhaps so numerous, section which is moving towards a position which is wholly irreconcilable with mediaeval methods of thought. The aim of the former is to produce an obedient laity, disciplined through the confessional, and satisfied with the sacramental ministrations of the Church. The aim of the latter is to give full play to scientific criticism in its dealing with the sacred texts, and to make the search for truth the task of a perfectly liberated intellect. It is impossible to combine two such opposite purposes in one system.

Meanwhile the great body of the Church, both clerical and lay, keeps to the old historical middle path, "clinging to all that is valuable in the old and welcoming all that is true in the new." The main desire of the Christian soul to-day is to make sure of the essentials of the Faith and to find in those essentials guidance amid the perplexities of the modern world. And more and more it is being realised that the essentials of the Faith are summed up in Jesus Christ. Fidelity to Him is to-day, as of old, the rock on which the Church must be built.

If the Church finds the continual source of her inspiration in Christ, she cannot go wrong. For, in Him, she has not only a personal object of Faith, but also a principle which will keep her ever in the true path. Also in Him, she will find that which overcomes the opposition between Faith and Freedom ; for He is, at once, the unchanging Word of God and the prophet of spiritual liberty.

Only in the strength of a Faith which is thus centred in Christ, can the Anglican Church use her great central position so as to become the means of drawing together into one the scattered elements of Christian Faith and Life. If she is true to her trust and capable of a large faith, she may, in the providence of God, be called to a very glorious destiny.

Of late years there has been a marked growth of the spirit of toleration with a corresponding dislike of religious controversy. This has been especially noticeable among the great body of sound Anglicans who are averse from extremes. They have been very reticent amid the conflict of opinions, though others of their fellow-Churchpeople have not. Meanwhile the Roman Catholics have been carrying on an active propaganda, and the Church of Rome has taken full advantage of the opportunities afforded it through the Press of putting itself in a favourable light before the British public. The consequence is that there has grown up in this country a generation less accurately informed than any that has preceded it about the great religious issues which were at stake in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

All along, till within the last thirty years or so, it has been customary for teaching to be given, in accordance with the 66th Canon, on the points of difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. That teaching has practically ceased, and it has therefore seemed that it might be timely and useful if a volume of essays were issued setting forth historically and otherwise the principles which formed the basis of the Reformation Settlement in England, and the opportunities of extended influence which lie before the Anglican Communion as Catholic and Reformed.

The writers of the Essays have all of them had in view the great end of the ultimate reunion of Christendom, so that the whole Catholic Church might confront its task of Christianising the world as visibly and co-operatively one Body. Yet there can be no reunion between us and a great and venerable part of the Western Church till, to quote Archbishop Laud's words, "Rome is other than she is." Nothing is more earnestly to be longed for than that the members of the Roman Church, and more particularly its leaders, should

become cognisant of the obstacles to reunion which arise from its persistence in its unreformed methods of teaching and influence. It is in no mere spirit of censoriousness that the errors of Rome are brought to light anew in this volume, but rather with a view to suggesting a reconsideration on all hands of the old difficulties which in that quarter obstruct the fulfilment of the Master's Great Design for the unity of His Church.

The Essays have been arranged, as far as possible, in a consecutive order, though they may be read independently of one another. The writers of the Essays have been of one mind as to the general aim and purpose of the book; but they have been placed under no limitations of self-expression, and, ranging as they do separately over a wide area of detail, each can be held responsible only for what he himself has written.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I. CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

PAGE

By the Most Rev. CHARLES F. D'ARCY, D.D., Hon. D.D. Oxford, *Archbishop of Armagh* . 1

II. ASPECTS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

By the Rev. R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D., *Rector of Broughton, Huntingdon, Author of "Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration," etc.* . 43

III. ROME AS UNREFORMED

By G. G. COULTON, M.A., Hon. Litt.D. Durham, *Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Author of "Christ, St. Francis, and To-Day," "The Roman Catholic Church and the Bible," etc.* . . 101

IV. COMMUNION OR MASS

By the Ven. W. L. PAIGE COX, B.D., *Archdeacon of Chester, Canon of Chester Cathedral* . . 139

V. THE CULTUS OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN

PAGE

By the Ven. JOHN H. THORPE, B.D., *Archdeacon of Macclesfield, Vicar of St. George's, Stockport* . 189

VI. THE NEW REFORMATION

By the Rev. CHARLES E. RAVEN, B.D., *Rector of Blechingley, Chaplain to the King, Late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* 241

VII. THE LAMBETH "APPEAL" AND ITS RESULTS

By the Most Rev. H. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D., D.C.L., *Formerly Archbishop of Melbourne* 271

APPENDIX

Extracts from the Pastorals of the late Right Rev. FRANCIS JOHN JAYNE, D.D., *Bishop of Chester* 1889–1919 303

INDEX 325

I

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

BY

THE MOST REV. CHARLES F. D'ARCY, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH

SYNOPSIS

A RECONSIDERATION of the nature and limits of human liberty is suggested by all the conditions of the world to-day. It is especially important in relation to Religion.

At the beginning, Christianity was essentially a spiritual movement. History reveals the story of its transformation into a world-power. In the West it became a monarchy. But, even in the Middle Ages, the liberating influence of the Christian Gospel became the parent of many movements antagonistic to autocratic rule. With the new birth of learning and the enlargement of ideas in the sixteenth century came the great revolt. An immediate effect was the proclamation of Christian Liberty.

The doctrine of Luther's *Freedom of a Christian Man* was the assertion of a true and vital principle. Yet it involves great dangers, for it sets free the mind of the individual in a way which may produce complete licence. How, then, are liberty and order to be reconciled ?

The example of science affords guidance in this difficulty. Here order is found to be the result of complete freedom, because a spiritual principle, reason, is dominant. Can we find any similar principle in Religion ?

The problem of authority in Religion demands consideration. Here we are confronted by the old question of the relation of the Church to the Bible. The doubts and controversies of the present day drive us back to an authority superior to both, the Divine Logos.

In Christ, the Word of God, we find the principle which can harmonise liberty with order. Applied to the problems of our own age, this principle points the way to a great unification in which is ample scope for all true human developments.

The framework described in the "Appeal" of the last Lambeth Conference provides a means of exhibiting the manner in which Christianity can become truly Catholic while realising more perfectly than ever the essentials of the Gospel of Christ.

GLADSTONE LIBRARY
HAWARDEN.

I

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

The catastrophic events of the last few years have created in the minds of men a sense of insecurity. All our social and political institutions are shaken. Many of them are manifestly crumbling. Empires have fallen. In the West not a single one remains, for the British confederation of peoples is no longer an empire. In the whole world, Japan is the only survivor ; and it also shows signs of transition. Europe has been Balkanised, and, however earnestly we may pray that the League of Nations may prove an effective guardian of peace, it will not be an easy task to control the nervous excitements of so many conflicting nationalities. Instability is the most obvious characteristic of such a world.

Meanwhile, the whole social system is in a state of solution. The institution of property, and its development in the form of capitalism, are threatened. In the largest of European States an effort to reorganise society on other principles has been actually attempted. In spite of the terrific tragedies which have marked this effort, the fever of its influence has more or less infected every people in the world.

It might appear that, at such a time, the need of mankind is not liberty but its repression ; for, if liberty is pushed to an extreme, the licence which brings anarchy may supervene. A further reflection should, however, convince us that the greatest need of

the world to-day is, not the repression of liberty, but that degree and moderation of it which will enable the spirit of man to work out his salvation without destructive violence. Hence, we must conclude, there can be no more important question than that which inquires into the nature and limits of individual liberty. But this great inquiry is not for us. We have to think of the relation of Christianity to the great human problems of our time.

The mission of Christianity is not, in the first instance, political or even social. It is spiritual—a mission to the soul. While it is true that the teachings of Christ give us the first principles of all social well-being, for the reason that they give the first principles of morality ; it is also true that there is no trace of a social programme. Christ proclaimed the Kingdom, and no one can attempt to realise the Kingdom under earthly conditions and remain indifferent to the social welfare of humanity. Nevertheless, Christ proceeded to form His Kingdom by the simple method of winning the heart of the individual and then uniting in a brotherhood all whose hearts had been won.

It was this method, carried out with singular devotion, which enabled Christianity to dissolve the ancient order and to become the most potent agent in the production of a new world. But in this process, the Christian Church, taking over the essential ideas and the legal framework of Roman Imperialism, and moving in a world in which monarchical principles were everywhere taken for granted, was transformed, in the West, into a monarchy of a new kind. As we read mediaeval history, we see the Popes, when at the height of their power, claiming dominion over every part of human life and actually exercising it. Possessing in the Interdict a weapon more terrifying than any material force, we see them deposing princes, reducing kings to subjection, breaking the Holy Roman Empire, setting in motion great crusades, sometimes against

the infidel in the East, sometimes against the heretic in the West, crushing with ruthless power every spiritual movement which seemed to mark a desire for independence on the part of the mind of man.

It is a profoundly interesting thing to read this history with close attention and then set it beside the simple story of the Gospels. If an effort be made to view the latter with a mind purged from ecclesiastical prejudices, the contrast is extraordinary. Jesus of Nazareth in His simple humanity, going about doing good; teaching simple folk about prayer and holy living and faith in God as "our Father"; setting forth the principles of the good life in language of unexampled sweetness and strength, and never losing Himself in metaphysical subtleties; proclaiming the Kingdom of God in a way which made it quite clear that it was not to be a kingdom of this world; making the appeal to each individual soul, and thus recognising the preciousness and independence of the individual conscience; regarding the saving of the lost sheep as worth every sacrifice; appealing to the sinners and outcasts with unfailing love and understanding; and sometimes using the most unsparing invective against the authorities of the Church to which He belonged and the high professors of religion. Such a Christ is far removed indeed from a Hildebrand or an Innocent III.

Struggles for Liberty in the Middle Ages

Even in the Middle Ages the contrast just indicated was realised. It was the inspiration of those outbreaks and strivings after liberty of conscience which from time to time shook the stability of the mediaeval Church and were put down with so much ferocity. In the reign of Innocent III., when the Papal monarchy was at the very highest height of its power, claiming complete supremacy in temporal things as a part of spiritual power, there broke out, all over Western Christendom,

an insurrection of the spirit of man against the dominant Church. In almost every instance, this movement can be most clearly traced to a longing for a return to the freedom and simplicity of the primitive Gospel. Even in an age of great ignorance there survived a tradition, or sprang up a vision, of the truth that Christianity is, in essence, not an imperial system, but a free life of the soul inspired by a direct relation to God. "From almost every part of Latin Christendom a cry of indignation and distress is raised by the clergy against the teachers or the sects which are withdrawing the people from their control. It is almost simultaneously heard in England, in Northern France, in Belgium, in Bretagne, in the whole diocese of Rheims, in Orleans, in Paris, in Germany, at Goslar, Cologne, Trèves, Metz, Strassburg. Throughout the whole south of France, and it should seem in Hungary, this sectarianism is the dominant religion. Even in Italy these opinions had made alarming progress. Innocent himself calls on the cities of Verona, Bologna, Florence, Milan, Placentia, Treviso, Bergamo, Mantua, Ferrara, Faenza, to cast out these multiplying sectaries. Even within or on the very borders of the Papal territory Viterbo is the principal seat of the revolt."[1]

That many dangerous heresies, both religious and social, were mixed up with this movement can hardly be denied. It was, indeed, inevitable. But the true inner meaning of the movement is unmistakable.

Nor were the forces behind this great revolt those of mere ignorant or unthinking reaction against constituted authority. Abelard, undoubtedly one of the greatest scholars and thinkers of the Middle Ages, had based all his teachings on the freedom of the human intellect to inquire into all things in heaven and earth. Armed with this principle he had dared to examine into the deepest mysteries of theology. His disciple, Arnold of Brescia, impelled by this new spirit, sought

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Book IX. ch. viii.

his inspiration in the Gospel of Christ. Here he found the remedy for the diseases of the time — a total abolition of all the pride, pomp, wealth, and secular authority of the Church.

It is impossible to disconnect the influence of these two great spirits of the twelfth century from those widespread movements of the period which immediately followed and which have been already mentioned. In the south of France, especially in Languedoc and Provence, there took place an early renaissance of which, it would seem, history has taken too little account. Here was born a brilliant literature. Here the civilisation of the period reached its highest point. Along with a free and careless life, gay with the songs of troubadours, there sprang up an extraordinary toleration in matters of religion. The authority of the Church was openly defied. It is impossible to deny that among the sects which arose at this time the Manichaean heresy flourished exceedingly. But it must be remembered that we know of these people mainly through the writings of their enemies ; and it seems clear that the rigorous asceticism of the Cathari was a rebuke to the luxury and vices of many of the Catholic clergy.

Far simpler and more primitive in their faith were the followers of Peter Waldo, the poor men of Lyons. Their inspiration came directly from the reading of the Gospels, which Peter had caused to be translated into the vulgar tongue. Going forth two by two, in imitation of the seventy, they preached the Gospel to the poor. Even their bitterest foes do not deny the holiness of their lives. Among the simple folk of the Alpine valleys they found their most enduring success.

All these movements were quenched in blood ; the renaissance of civilisation was postponed ; freedom of thought, so nearly attained in Southern France, ceased for centuries. Yet a spark remained. It kindled

Dante : it inspired Petrarch : it prepared the way for the new learning and for the Reformation.

Brilliant as was the Italian Renaissance when it came, it lacked the moral strength needed for a true re-birth of the human spirit. That could come only when the inflexible mind and will of the peoples of the North were awakened. It is one of the glories of England that this awakening began with John Wyclif. From Wyclif the torch passed to Hus. Both were men of great learning and endowed with intellect of a very high order. But it is worthy of note that, in each case, the liberation of mind came from a return to the study of the Holy Scriptures. Hus appealed from the Pope to Christ. "I, John Hus, offer this appeal to Jesus Christ, my Master and my just Judge, who knows, defends, and judges the just cause." [1]

Lecky, in words which have become famous, contrasting Platonism and Stoicism with Christianity, points to the influence of the person and life of Jesus upon the hearts of men : "the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and all the exhortations of moralists. This has indeed been the well-spring of whatever is best and purest in Christian life. Amid all the sins and failings, amid all the priestcraft and persecution and fanaticism that have defaced the Church, it has preserved, in the character and example of its Founder, an enduring principle of regeneration." [2]

No one can read the history of Christianity without recognising that every fresh and true inspiration which has put new life into the Church owes its origin to this source. The fact of Christ is indeed "an enduring principle of regeneration." But it has not been sufficiently considered that this same fact has also been an enduring principle of liberation. Every step

[1] See Milman, Bk. XIII. ch. viii., and Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, Bk. II. ch. v.

[2] *History of European Morals*, chap. iv.

onwards in the path of true spiritual progress has been taken after a return to the study of Holy Scripture ; and this return has meant in every instance a fresh flowing forth of influence from the same wonderful Personality.

The Reformation

When we consider the period of the Reformation we find all these influences at work, but in a new situation. The invention of printing, the discovery of the New World, the revolution in astronomy with which the name of Copernicus is identified, the new learning which found its prophet in Erasmus : all these wonderful things conspired to produce an expansion of the human mind unexampled in history.[1]

It was the greatest epoch since the beginning of the Christian era. Man found himself in a new world —a world with a vaster outlook, a wider horizon, than had ever been imagined by his forefathers. Liberation of thought was inevitable. Of this change, Luther's *Freedom of a Christian Man* is the characteristic expression. The essence of this little book is its affirmation of the liberating effect of faith, not negatively, but positively. The soul which is in a true relation to God is endowed with the Freedom of the Heavenly City, and while, through faith and charity, the servant of all, is yet above every authority which would limit his freedom. Thus every Christian man, no matter how lowly his station in this world, or how common his work, is engaged in a sacred duty as truly as the priest who ministers at the altar. Also, it follows that his conscience must assert itself against every power which would demand its submission.

For Luther, faith is personal trust in Christ—a personal relation to God. He insisted on the sense of direct responsibility to God and dependence on Him alone. He holds that God cares " for each soul

[1] See R. H. Murray, *Erasmus and Luther*.

separately as though there were only one soul and no other on earth existed."[1] Here we trace the influence of the mystics, of whom Eckhart and Tauler may be regarded as the most characteristic spirits. It is now recognised that their share in the spiritual preparation for the Reformation was of vital importance. The immediate access of the soul to God, to which they witnessed so impressively, is indeed the very corner-stone of Luther's life and doctrine, as it has been the foundation of all evangelical teaching ever since. It is strange that, as Dr. Murray points out, he appealed usually to St. Paul for his proofs. To us of to-day, the source of this teaching is Christ Himself.

The Right of Private Judgement

It is clear that Luther's way of presenting his doctrine of faith, with its implication of the freedom of every individual soul, is full of danger. It leads directly to that chaos of individualism which has marked a large part of the Christian world since his time. It involves exactly the difficulty which attaches to St. Paul's teaching when he writes, "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man." Yet, with all its difficulties, this doctrine is one which, from the very nature of things, must be presented to the growing intelligence of mankind. It stands for a truth which is final and unavoidable. There is in every mind an ultimate faculty of judgement which, once its reality has been revealed, must be recognised. When a man, convinced of the truth, and having done his best to make sure that his conviction is the truth, feels that it is his duty, in the sight of God, to abide by this decision at all costs, he has reached a position which is morally inexpugnable. This is the stronghold of an *Athanasius contra mundum*. It is Luther's "Here I stand. I

[1] Murray, *op. cit.* ch. iv. p. 135. See pp. 130 ff.

can do no other." Two principles are involved : the absolute sovereignty of truth, and the finality of personality. Expressed in the language of religion, God and the soul of man are here face to face. No human authority has the right to intervene.

A crucial illustration of the moral and intellectual situation which thus comes into being is the position of one who in our time deliberately submits himself to the authority of the Papal See. Here the claim to infallibility is urged with all the parade of great pretensions. If a mind is merely overwhelmed by these pretensions, or yields through moral weariness, the decision has no spiritual value whatever. Only when there is conviction and deliberate choice can the action be morally justified. But this conviction and deliberate choice mean that the Papal claims have been submitted to the judgement of the individual and have been accepted. Their value for the individual is the value of his own judgement. He may fortify his decision by appealing to the multitudes who accept the authority of the Papal See, or by consideration of its august history and splendid monuments ; but, in every instance, he passes judgement on the evidential value of these various considerations. In the last resort, the infallibility of the Pope resolves itself into the infallibility of his own private judgement.[1] We find, in fact, when we penetrate deeply enough into the grounds of conviction, that, for the mind whose decision is truly conscientious, there is no power or authority which can intervene between God and the soul. This is the essence of Luther's doctrine. It is an eternal truth.

Authority in Religion

Where, then, is the seat of authority in Religion ? When the principle of individual liberty is thus set

[1] See Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, ch. iii.

forth it seems to lead directly to chaos. If there be no authority above that of the intellect and conscience of every man, how can there ever emerge such a consensus of belief as will secure some degree of unity among Christian people? Yet it is certain that the Christian Faith was intended from the very beginning to form a bond of union and to create a fellowship among men. The existence of such a fellowship, and the idea of it, are primitive possessions of the Christian ethos. They come before all developments of doctrine.[1]

In considering this question it is worth while to turn aside for a moment from the agitating controversies of theology and consider the calmer realm of science. It is important to reflect that the whole wonderful progress of scientific discovery and its growing success and certainty date from the liberation of the human intellect in the sixteenth century. Since that liberation the advance of science has been unceasing. It is the greatest achievement in the whole of human history, and the most surprising, when we consider how much has been accomplished in a few centuries. And not only does this marvellous advance date from the liberation of the human mind, but it is clearly due to that liberation. It has taken place for the simple reason that research is open to every man, that the investigator can challenge any conclusion and give his reasons for doing so. Yet this complete liberty, instead of resulting in chaos, has produced a universal consent over vast ranges of knowledge. Here liberty has proved itself the parent of order.

The cause of this complete agreement of liberty and order is clear. Dominant over the whole realm of science is reason, that is, the disciplined use of intelligence. The end of scientific activity is truth,

[1] See Acts ii. 42, iv. 32; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 1, etc. See also Dr. Anderson Scott's article, "What happened at Pentecost," in the volume entitled *The Spirit*.

the principle which guides the search for truth is reason. No one in these days can for a moment admit any other authorities. No institution, no individual, no system, no book, can be put into competition with them. In our day, we have seen the great authority of Newton and the immense system of thought about the physical universe with which his name is identified freely challenged. Our prejudices may rebel, but our minds recognise at once the right of every investigator who believes he has gained a larger and truer view of the universe to place his doctrines before the scientific world and prove them if he can. Truth and reason must ever be supreme.

This illustration presents us with a principle which would seem to cover the whole realm of thought. There is nothing in the nature of things to confine it to the natural sciences. It is this: the only kind of authority which can bring liberty and order into agreement is that which rules by appealing to the spiritual faculties of every individual and which asserts itself by persuasion. It would be enough to say of such an authority that it must rule by its appeal to the reason, if the word reason be used in the widest sense. This is largely a question of words. The essence of the whole matter is that no controversy can be settled by the fiat of any man, or any society of men, or by the authority of any tradition or body of teaching. Only by evidence and demonstration of fact, presented in terms intelligible to the mind, and always subject to the tests of further examination and verification, can scientific truth be established so as to claim the general assent of mankind.

This is not, as some seem to think, the assertion of material methods. Quite the contrary. It is the liberation of spiritual principles. It is the complete setting free of knowledge, imagination, will—among the highest powers of the spirit of man—that they may dominate the material. From a religious point of view, it is

a triumph of faith and hope over ignorance and superstition. And every step of the great progress is based upon the conviction that there is a fundamental trustworthiness in the universe. Here is the faith which underlies all true thinking and living, whether regarded from the side of religion or from that of science.

Church and Bible

Controversies concerning authority in religion have most frequently dealt with certain great elements in Christian experience which have been exalted to a position of supremacy in accordance with the ideas of the periods to which they correspond. In primitive times, the things to which the Apostles witnessed were accepted. In the centuries that followed, this witness became transformed into the consensus of the Christian community, as proved by the confession of the assembled bishops. The most noteworthy expression of this authority is to be found in the Council of Nicaea. In later ages, as we have seen, there grew up a monarchical conception of the Church which, for Western Christendom, centred authority at Rome in the person of the Pope. This immense development, which owed its existence to causes which have been clearly demonstrated in history, was fortified by a great series of forgeries, and established by the awful sanction of the Interdict—an instrument overwhelming in an ignorant and superstitious age. It is strange, however, to reflect that its complete expression in doctrinal form was reserved for the nineteenth century, when, at the Vatican Council in 1870, Pope Pius IX. claimed personal infallibility.

Long before this, however, another authority had been recognised : Holy Scripture. In primitive times it was accepted concurrently with the witness of the Church. The one authority was used to test or fortify the other. This was an eminently reasonable

proceeding and arose in a perfectly natural way. Differences of opinion existed in the earlier centuries as to whether certain books should be included in the Canon of the New Testament. But as to the authority of the books which were acknowledged there was no question. When we come to the time of St. Augustine we find Holy Scripture employed in much the same way that it is used by the uncritical expositor of modern times.

At the Reformation, however, when great bodies of Christians disowned the authority of the Roman See and denied some of the doctrines which that See maintained, the authority of Holy Scripture and its relation to other authorities became a question of burning importance. It was the reading of Holy Scripture which inspired Wyclif, Hus, Luther, in their revolt. It was clear that the Church of the time taught doctrines and encouraged practices which have no place in the New Testament. Thus the authority of Holy Scripture and the authority of the Church came into conflict. And as the former was admitted by all parties, the Reformers were able to occupy a very strong position. So definitely was this position established that finally Chillingworth, himself a High Churchman and friend of Laud, having fought his way through the whole controversy, first as a convert to Romanism, and then as an Anglican, was able to sum up his argument in the famous words, "The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." His book, *The Religion of Protestants a safe Way of Salvation*, may be said to mark the culmination of the great movement of thought which began with Wyclif.

Out of these controversies emerged a question as to the relation of the Bible to the Church which derived all its seriousness from the great issues of the Reformation. Do we, it was asked, accept the Bible on the authority of the Church, or the Church on the authority

of the Bible? Which authority is primary? The problem was not new, for in the Middle Ages the Church was understood to guarantee the Canon of Scripture and to decide as to its interpretation. Even St. Augustine has been quoted as teaching this doctrine, though it may well be doubted whether it assumed that form in his mind.

Those who in modern times maintain the priority of the authority of the Church urge that it existed before the New Testament was written. And this must be granted, for the Church certainly existed as an organised fellowship from the Day of Pentecost at latest. At that time no single book of the New Testament had been written. The witness of the Apostles to the facts of Christ's life, death, and resurrection, and their declaration as to the meaning of those facts, constituted the whole Gospel message as known to the disciples.

Yet when we read the history of the formation of the Canon we find that this argument regards the facts in a wholly artificial and unnatural way. There was no formal act of authority by which the Church certified the accuracy of the Canon of Holy Scripture. Councils took no step to resolve doubts until the main points had been settled by use and custom. As every reader of Eusebius knows, doubts concerning some of the books of the New Testament remained until his time. As regards the Old Testament, there is no complete agreement even to this day, for the Council of Trent includes the Apocrypha in its list of canonical books, and anathematises all who refuse to recognise them.

The fact is that, as Provost Salmon used to say, "the Canon shaped itself." The real witness to the truth of Holy Scripture is the nature of its contents. With regard to the New Testament, this fact is especially evident. In the beginning, the Gospels and Epistles had, of course, the testimony of those

who knew the witness of the Apostles. The consciousness of the early Church and the writings of Apostles and apostolic men which came to form the New Testament interacted and shaped one another. At that time it would have been impossible to separate the two elements. They belonged to one another, and it would be just as true to say that the New Testament witnessed to the Church as that the Church witnessed to the New Testament. It was only when the early tradition faded and the New Testament was recognised as an authoritative collection of documents which the Church treasured as containing the true account of the facts and teachings for which it stood, that the one could be contrasted with the other.

This contrast is found for the first time, it would appear, in Tertullian. In his *Praescriptio adversus Haereticos* he argues against the Gnostic heretics of the time, who interpreted Holy Scripture in their own peculiar way. He urges that Scripture must be interpreted in accordance with the Rule of Faith which the Apostles delivered to the Church and which had been handed down from generation to generation in the Apostolic Churches.[1] Of this Rule of Faith Tertullian gives the outline. It is in very close correspondence with the Creed which we call the Apostles' Creed.[2] He goes on to argue that the Apostles did not keep back any deposit of doctrine other than this. There was no occult tradition secretly entrusted to an inner circle.[3] This Faith, Tertullian argues, is to be found in all Churches everywhere. He points especially to the "Apostolic Churches, in which the very seats of the Apostles still preside in their places, in which their own authentic writings are read."[4] He points to Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Rome. The Apostolic succession which he has in his mind is a succession of witness

[1] *Op. cit.* ch. xix.
[2] Ch. xiii.
[3] Ch. xxv. on 1 Tim. vi. 20.
[4] Ch. xxxvi.

to the simple essential creed of Christianity, which, he holds, must be regarded as the true key to the understanding of Holy Scripture, as contrasted with the later and more arbitrary interpretations given by the Marcionites and Valentinians. Therefore he claims prescription for the Church's doctrine as the true interpretation. It is a good and sound argument. The best guide to the real meaning of an ambiguous passage in the writings of an author is a knowledge of his ruling ideas. The ruling ideas of the writers of the New Testament books were to be found in the common tradition of all the Catholic Churches. In Tertullian's day the argument was especially impressive, because no more than a century had elapsed since the last of the original witnesses had passed away. The heretics were preachers of novelty.

The argument from the agreement of all Christian Churches as to the Rule of Faith was familiar before Tertullian's time. It is found in Hegesippus. Travelling from Palestine to Rome, in the middle of the second century, he met many bishops and heard the same doctrine from them all. Still more fully, so far as our knowledge extends, is this same testimony given by Irenaeus. Like Tertullian, he appeals to the successions of the bishops in the Apostolic Churches, to their united witness to the Rule of Faith, and asserts that no other tradition existed.[1]

It still remains true that the only trustworthy guide to the understanding of the New Testament is the simple statement of the essentials of Christian belief which the universal Church has handed down. And in our day, as in the times of Irenaeus and Tertullian, here is to be found the only sure protection against the extravagant fancies of arbitrary interpretation. For it must be remembered that the books of the

[1] See Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, ch. i. On "Apostolic Succession and its Original Value," see the article by C. H. Turner in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*; and Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, Lect. III. § iv. and Lect. VII. § iv.

New Testament do not present us with a systematic body of divinity. They are, for the most part, occasional writings produced to supply the needs of their time, and for people who already possessed the elements of the Christian Faith. On the other hand, it is very worthy of note that Irenaeus and Tertullian distinctly deny the existence of any deposit of tradition other than the simple and universally recognised Rule of Faith. They thus anticipate and destroy the claim, so often made by modern controversialists, that the Church holds a body of tradition containing things not taught in Holy Scripture. The Council of Trent distinctly claims for the Church of Rome such a body of traditions, describing them as " unwritten traditions, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself or dictated by the Holy Spirit and by continual succession preserved in the Catholic Church." The same Decree declares that these traditions relate " as well to faith as to morals."[1] They are not therefore customs such as those recognised by our Art. XXXIV.

The more fully the relation of the Bible to the Church in the primitive age is considered, the more true and just will be found the statement of our Art. XX. that " although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." The two authorities, the Bible and the Church, are interdependent. If the Church is a witness and keeper of the Bible, the Bible is also a witness and keeper of the Church. When the Church has gone astray, it is because she has lost her hold upon the Bible, and only the reaction of the Bible upon her can bring her back to the true path. There is a saying which has been appealed to as a first principle, and which has indeed become a cliché, repeated without very much thought : " The Church

[1] Council of Trent, Session IV.

to teach, the Bible to prove." If this means that it is the duty of the Church in every age to hand on the Primitive Rule of Faith, as expressed in the Great Creeds, and to maintain this rule by continual appeal to Holy Scripture, it is sound enough. But if it is taken to mean that the Church as a teacher is above criticism, an original source of Divine knowledge whose interpretations of Scripture must be accepted without examination, it is not only false in itself, but also destructive of all truth. For truth must ever be prepared to stand the searching light of free investigation.

The Ultimate Authority

It is surprising that those who have engaged in this discussion have so seldom considered that there is an authority superior to both Church and Bible, and from which both derive all of truth that they possess. Christ is the Logos, the Word made Flesh. He is the Light of the World. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Or, in the great words recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, " All things have been delivered unto me of my Father ; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father ; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." It is true that Christ also says, " Ye are the light of the world," but this is altogether in a derivative and dependent manner. The source of illumination is the Divine Christ Himself. The Church apart from Him is a poor thing : when she has failed to follow Him she has always failed in her mission, no matter how great her position in the world. So it was in the Middle Ages, when her corruption and abuses shocked the conscience of every sincere soul ; and when she was saved by Francis of Assisi, who had caught something of the mind of Jesus Christ. So it was also, after the Reformation, in the awful days of the wars of religion when, on both

sides, political ferocities were edged with theological bitterness.

Again, the Bible is great as literature, notable as history ; but its supreme value is that it presents the world with Jesus Christ. Here we learn to know Him. Here we have His teaching. Here we come under the spell of His death, His passion, His resurrection. In this respect the Bible must always come first as a witness to Him. Nowhere else, not in creed or in sacrament, can we learn of Him with the same fulness of knowledge as in the Gospel story. For creed and sacrament derive all their meaning for us from that story. Of what value would they be to us if Jesus Christ, His life, death, and resurrection, as recorded in the Gospels, were not presupposed in them? "These are they," St. John records our Lord as saying of the Old Testament Scriptures, "which testify of me." How much more is this true of the New Testament books which give us so vivid a picture of Him, and tell us of His works and words ?

When we come to consider the matter further, I think we shall find that Christ Himself is not only the Supreme Authority, above Church and Bible on account of His position ; He is also an authority to which we can refer with much higher certainty. Who to-day knows what is the voice of the Church on any question, with the signal exception of the Primitive Rule of Faith ? With regard to almost every other matter, dissentients may be counted by scores of millions, in many cases by hundreds of millions—baptized Christians professing the old Faith. The rule *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* applies to-day to nothing but the Primitive Rule of Faith. The fact that this is true is in itself a magnificent testimony to the essential character of the Rule.

The testimony of the Bible is, as evidence, in much the same position. For here enters a specially modern problem. To the old perplexities of interpretation

are added those arising from modern criticism. It is true that, in relation to the New Testament, criticism has been, of late, restoring to a large extent important elements which formerly it seemed to take away. But the net result of the whole critical movement is that no scholar can now quote the texts of the New Testament in the old fashion, regarding every word as an authoritative oracle. In order to carry conviction, he must take account of the conclusions of the critics; and, as these conclusions are by no means final in many cases, the value of the isolated text is quite different from what it used to be. To draw safe conclusions from the New Testament now, the student must base his argument on a broad foundation : he must show that the results of his study spring from the general tendency of the whole, that they are supported by classes of passages which undoubtedly represent the things and beliefs which were recognised as true at the beginning. To do this is not to accept modern criticism as an infallible guide. It is merely to secure a firm foundation, in view of the ideas of the time. Now here, again, it is clear that the Primitive Rule of Faith stands out with splendid clearness. The whole New Testament testifies to it. It is, in fact, the key which unlocks the New Testament, and indeed the Old Testament also, as nothing else can. The efforts which have been made to find something different as the essential meaning of the Bible have failed as signally in our day as they failed in the time of Tertullian.

If all this be true, it may be asked, Is there no progress in Christian belief? Are we never to get beyond the old Rule of Faith? In one sense, never. But this does not mean that the Christian Revelation contains no special message for each age as it comes. It does not mean that it can shed no light on the spiritual problems of our own age in particular. One most striking effect of our controversies has been to

concentrate attention on the supreme fact of Christ. In a manner which is wonderfully fresh and vivid, He has dawned upon the spiritual vision of the modern Christian world. It is indeed a new Revelation. And when Christ stands revealed He must become our teacher and guide. Once again He is presented as the Light of the World.

The Divine Logos

It was pointed out above that it is only control by a spiritual principle which can harmonise liberty and order. In science the principle which brings this great agreement to pass is called reason. We have seen that, from the side of religion, it might also be called faith. But the experience of many centuries has at last convinced the world that the reason which controls the labours of science and brings them to success fails to achieve a like result in religion. It is not that reason is at fault. It is rather that the things of the religious life pass beyond the sphere in which reason finds its scientific exercise. But it does not follow that the resources of the reason which is the other side of faith are therefore exhausted. The truth is that science deals with certain abstract spheres of experience. Therefore it can use the processes of reason with precision and clearness. But religion has to do with the whole meaning of the spiritual life of man. Its task is to reveal something of the source, process, and final purpose of the multitude of thinking, feeling, willing beings. It has to do with personalities, as individuals, and as united in a great community. It has to seek the inner meaning of human history. Now it is clear that no abstract law, such as physical science delights to discover, can do this. Nor can any mere descriptive category, such as biology affords as the result of its researches into the processes by which living things change their

forms, serve our purpose. Surely it is not unreasonable to hold that the one adequate principle for such an inquiry is to be found in personality itself; and if history shows us a Personality holding a dominant position in relation to the whole of humanity, we cannot be wrong in looking to Him for the guidance that we need.

It is not insignificant that out of the long process of ancient philosophical thought there emerged a conception which supplies the clue to the problem before us. When we regard Jesus Christ as the Divine Logos, made flesh and dwelling among men, we have exactly what we need. At once a vivid light is thrown on the source, meaning, and purpose of the whole creative process and its issue in human history. And it is very specially significant that, at the present time, when the disorganised state of the Church has largely destroyed its authority, and when critical views have upset our traditional use of Holy Scripture, the spiritual value and power of Jesus Christ have been revealed to the world with fresh distinctness. It is not too much to say that, for all thinking people of our time who have been brought under Christian influence, the supremely important question is, "What think ye of Christ?" It is also true that in the present confused state of the world, when the lack of some great organising principle is so keenly felt, the thoughts of many hearts in every land are seeking to find in Jesus Christ, and in the principles for which He stands, the guidance which mankind needs so sorely. As a great mountain peak rises more and more into view, dominating the lesser heights with more conspicuous greatness, as we move away from it, so does the lapse of time reveal to us the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ. We may surely dare to say that in Him, if anywhere in human experience, is to be found the influence which can bring unity into the contending individualisms of our anarchic life. Here,

revealed in a Person and Life, is the Logos, the Word or Reason, which must prevail over our differences and antagonisms, if liberty is to find its legitimate exercise and at the same time the Christian fellowship to be realised.

Christ and Human Life

Having reached this point, let us examine briefly the teaching of our Lord on those elements of our moral and religious life which have confronted us in our study of religious liberty.

First, He is, supremely, the teacher of a true individualism. He revealed man's personal individuality, with all its worth, its dangers, and its responsibilities. We are so familiar with this teaching that we fail to realise its freshness and power. Only within the last few centuries has it been fully grasped, but it has been grasped so firmly that it has come to seem a truism, even though, in practice, we may often fail to act upon it. The preciousness of the individual soul, whether it be the soul of a king or of a slave, is fundamental in the teaching of Christ. Compare Aristotle's " animated tool." [1] Under ancient Roman law the individual as such had no rights. Natural feelings of humanity, no doubt, modified this in practice, and Antoninus Pius made it a criminal offence for a master to kill a slave without a cause, and Constantine, under Christian influence, went even further. But these were but mitigations. In the eye of the law the slave had no rights as a person : he was the mere instrument of his master. And this remained even under the law of the orthodox Justinian and in a world which had become Christian. Throughout the whole of that famous Code, whether it regards slaves, or the limited liberties of freedmen and serfs, or in the scale of punishments which it lays

[1] Aristotle's description of a slave, *Eth. Nic.* viii. 11.

down, runs, as an admitted principle, respect of persons.[1] The equality of men in the sight of God, which could not be denied as a principle of Divine judgement, had no place in the arrangements of the Christian commonwealth on earth.

It is in its recognition of the absolute and unique value of every human soul that the teaching of Christ establishes the essential freedom of man. Our Lord's mission to the outcasts of Israel, to the publicans and sinners, is the practical expression of the same truth. He came to seek and to save that which was lost. "How think ye? If any man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and go unto the mountains, and seek that which goeth astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth over it more than over the ninety and nine which have not gone astray."[2] So it was too that he taught men to look within and discern for themselves the preciousness of their own souls. "What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self?"[3] "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"[4] Such passages could be multiplied manifold from His teaching, while every page of the Gospels witnesses to their place in His mission. But perhaps there is no instance which more significantly reveals their implication than that in which He teaches the essential nature of prayer. "Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret."[5] Here is the human soul face to face with God, with no human or angelic intermediary, speaking in simple faith to the Almighty as to a Father whose love will most certainly accept the petition. In this direct access of the soul to God is involved its freedom. It is, more-

[1] See *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, vol. ii. ch. iii.
[2] Matt. xviii. 12, 13.
[3] Luke ix. 25.
[4] Matt. xvi. 26.
[5] Matt. vi. 6.

over, a freedom which carries with it the highest degree of liberation, for, in the presence of God, the sovereign claims of truth are revealed and conscience demands full recognition.

It is also to be observed that our Lord most distinctly brought this principle out from the secret inner life and made it effective as a moral and social law. This is expressed in the parable of the Good Samaritan, in which the law of brotherhood is extended beyond the chosen people, and this extension emphasised by the selection of a member of a despised and hated sect for the part of benefactor. The two principles which are thus taught, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, constitute the very charter of human liberty.

Most important, however, is it to be noted that the liberty which springs from the source which has been described is one which absolutely forbids licence. For the soul which thus realises its liberty is at once subjected to the law of God ; and that law, as Christ taught us, is the law of love. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang the whole law and the prophets." As Luther put it, two great truths stand side by side. They are complementary. The Christian man is lord of all, free, subject to none: the Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, subject to all. He is the first by faith, the second by charity. Thus is the principle of individualism reconciled with the principle of socialisation.

From the natural point of view these two principles seem to stand apart in hopeless antagonism. If the individual gains complete licence, the most heartless selfishness must result. If the socialist could reduce the individual to a position of perfect subjection, there

would be an end of all liberty, and therefore an end of personal development. It is profoundly interesting to reflect that Christ is on both sides of this controversy. On the one hand, He exalts the individual to the highest height of self-realisation; on the other, He subjects him to that law which most of all subdues selfishness, the law of Love. If our Lord's teaching could be made fully effective in the everyday life of man, it would solve the problem of the modern world. And here is in truth the only perfect solution. Only when the influence of Christ so prevails in the world that men learn to live and work as children of God and, in love, to serve one another, shall we be saved from a selfish individualism or a degrading collectivism.

The Duty of the Church

If the Church of Christ could find a way by which to instil these primary teachings of the Master into the hearts of men she would do more for mankind than has ever yet been accomplished by any influence in any age. But how can a way be found? We look out upon the Christian world and we see it divided into competing sections, each anxious to push its own peculiar methods and ways of thought. We see ambitious priesthoods striving for power, with the conviction that clerical control over the individual and over society is the one solution of the world's problem, forgetting that the world grew sick of that method many centuries ago; because it was tried and found wanting. We have seen well-intentioned persons, full of enthusiasm and hope, initiate new movements which seemed for a time to promise great renewals of faith and Christian living; and we have seen these movements resolve themselves into new sects, thus adding to the good they undoubtedly accomplished the evil of fresh divisions.

One cheering sign there is at the present time—the growing desire for the unification of Christian forces.

Efforts towards reunion are occupying a large share in the attention of Christian leaders. Conferences between such leaders have been held, world-wide organisations have been formed, a considerable and growing literature has come into existence. It can hardly be denied that the *Appeal to all Christian People* issued by the last Lambeth Conference has made an epoch in this movement. Its reception by important leaders of other Churches is already sufficiently favourable to form a ground of hope. The importance of the "Appeal" rests upon the fact that it does more than express a general willingness to enter into negotiations with bodies of Christians outside the Anglican Communion : it puts forward a definite proposal framed on large and very comprehensive lines. Moreover, it expresses, in a new way, the sense of penitence for past failings. It recognises that the faults which brought about the divisions of Christendom are not on one side only.

The proposals of the Lambeth "Appeal" provide exactly the framework required to exhibit in clear perspective the practical working out of the principles of Christian liberty which have been set forth above. They also help to bring us back to the teachings of our Lord.

"We believe," write the bishops, "that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of :

"The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith ; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief :

"The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ :

"A ministry acknowledged by every part of the

Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."

Christ and Creed

We have dealt sufficiently, so far as space permitted, with the position of Holy Scripture as the one means by which the Church in these latter days can be brought near to Christ and by which she can be kept from wandering away from Him. It remains to say a few necessary words on the relation of Christ to the Creeds. These ancient confessions of faith are remarkable for their brevity and for their simplicity. They hand on from generation to generation the Primitive Rule of Faith. In the main they are statements of facts. With facts, however, they combine some measure of interpretation and an expression of the great hopes for the future which the facts justify. In the Nicene Creed there is a strong element of theology in its statements concerning the Deity of Christ, His Incarnation and Atonement, and concerning the Person and work of the Holy Spirit. But all these are the very elements of belief which drew into unity the early Church, and to which, even in this distracting and critical age, the great mass of professing Christians of all denominations give their adhesion, and in which they find their inspiration. How striking is the contrast between the brevity and simplicity of these early creeds and the complexity and metaphysical subtlety of the long confessions of the sixteenth century! Efforts have been made in modern times, especially in America, to find some statement of the fundamentals of Christian faith which might take the place of these ancient symbols. But every effort of the kind has failed. Even where some success has been attained, it has only been that degree of it which has been sufficient to attract a certain number of adherents and

so create another Christian sect. It is clear that any attempt to find a substitute for the ancient Creeds can but add to the confusion.

When we turn to the life of Christ we find nothing at all about creeds. Jesus Christ teaches about the Father, calls sinners to repentance, gives instruction on certain elements of practical religion and morals, performs wonderful works of mercy, presents Himself as, with the Father, the one supreme object of human trust and devotion, lives a life which draws needy souls to Him, dies, rises again. But He nowhere says, "Here is a statement of the true faith which you must accept." He gives no sign at all that He desired His followers to have clear-cut conceptions of doctrine on all the great questions which concern God and man and their relation to one another. Why, then, should the Church demand anything more than assent to that primitive interpretation which enabled Christians to worship and serve Him, and to find in Him their hope for the future?

As Irenaeus and Tertullian show, in the early age the Primitive Rule of Faith was the great bond of union among all Christian Churches. A terrible change took place when the Creed began to be used, not as a bond of union, but as a symbol for exclusion. It may appear that this was inevitable, on account of the springing up of a multitude of heresies. Yes, but when exclusion was transformed into persecution, and when, as happened in later times, the tests of orthodoxy were multiplied and heretics were tortured and killed, there took place a complete reversal of the spirit and teaching of Christ. In all history there is nothing more awful than the fact that the word "Catholic," which signifies inclusion, became the watch-word of a vast system of terrorism. Can we imagine Jesus Christ, if He had been in command of the national forces of His time, pursuing the Samaritans with fire and sword? It is matter for deep reflection

that He showed an extraordinary tenderness towards the heretics and schismatics of His time, who were outlawed by the Jewish Church, to which He belonged, and that He selected one of them as the very symbol of the love He taught His disciples.

If it is to be in accordance with the mind of Christ, a creed must then be simply a statement of those beliefs which are essential in order to secure our common worship and service of the Divine Christ, our trust in Him as our Saviour, and our hope in Him for the future. Its purpose must be to unite all believers in the one fellowship.

It is clear that the effect of this is to secure also a large and splendid liberty. There is room for the development of the individual mind, and for the development of many types of Christian ethos. In the early days, when creeds were simple, there was a freedom in this respect which to us to-day would seem impossible within the bounds of one Church. The passion for uniformity arose in later times. And, in these days, when Christianity is spreading into many lands hitherto untouched, and when vast and ancient civilisations such as those of China, India, and Japan are being influenced by it, nothing is more important than a restoration of the ancient freedom.

It is in full accordance with this that the Lambeth "Appeal" presents a vision "of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all 'who profess and call themselves Christians,' within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled." Surely

it is impossible to imagine any conception more fully in accordance with the mind of Christ than this. In Him is no doctrinaire rigidity, no trace of the ecclesiastical martinet, no love of ceremonial exactness, no tendency towards the imposition of a stringent rule in forms of worship or in the ordering of the religious life. In prayer, in fasting, in alms-giving, He insisted on inward reality and avoidance of all outward display. His principle in these things is always the soul in free relationship to God, not the soul as disciplined by rule. Not that rule is evil in itself, but that it must be ever subordinate to the higher principle. The tendency of the Jewish Church at the time of our Lord was towards a scrupulous observance of the Law. The Law, elaborated by the traditions and rules of its official representatives, was becoming a system of tyrannous severity, a system which issued in the cult of formalism and minute exactness. Against this tendency our Lord protested in language which seems to us to-day, when we consider that it refers to the respectable churchmen of the time, as almost passing the bounds of possibility. We feel that only His penetration into the hearts of those of whom He spoke could have justified it. It stands for all ages as His witness against the evils of ecclesiastical tyranny and of formalism in religion. Together with St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, it remains a perpetual vindication of Christian liberty.

The Sacraments

In its dealing with the sacraments, the Lambeth "Appeal" adopts a similar breadth of view. Here the two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself are set apart, as in our own formularies, as the normal expression of the corporate life of the Church. It was stated above that the rule *Securus judicat orbis terrarum* can be truly applied only to the Primitive Rule of Faith,

but this was with reference to the essentials of belief. When we come to consider the corporate life of the Church, and when we ask what elements have survived through all the centuries of controversy, and have maintained themselves by their inherent excellence among all great bodies of professing Christians in spite of division and even conflict, we find the two great sacraments standing out pre-eminent. There are indeed some bodies of Christian people who do not observe these sacraments, but their numbers are small, and experience of past movements of the kind prove that they do not maintain themselves. Lacking these essential elements of the Christian organic life they tend to disappear. On the other hand, the Churches which have kept the two great sacraments as the bonds of their corporate life have been able to grow in strength from generation to generation. Here, as in the case of the Primitive Rule of Faith, we find a consensus among all great bodies of Christian people. It is clear that it would be impossible to bring these bodies together on any other condition of sacramental observance. To increase the number of sacraments would be as fatal to the prospects of reunion as to omit them altogether.

The Ministry

The third condition of reunion laid down in the Lambeth "Appeal" is concerned with the ministry. The elements of the ministry, as stated there, are the inward call of the Spirit, the commission of Christ, and the authority of the whole body. The last is the critical point of the discussion. If the Church, with solemn prayer, and with the will to obey the command of Christ, sets apart certain men to be His ministers, we cannot doubt His approval, if we recognise the authority of the Church. The whole question depends on this recognition. What is needed to bring

the separated bodies of Christian people into unity is, as the "Appeal" puts it, "a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church" as possessing the essentials which have been stated. The problem of reunion practically resolves itself into this question of universal acknowledgement. Here it is clear that the Anglican Communion occupies a position of peculiar strength and usefulness. Retaining the old order which has come down unbroken from the beginnings of Church history, she is not bound to any monarchical system nor has she ever made any claim to infallible authority. With her, the continuous organic connection with primitive Christianity for which her Orders stand has been all along a fact of life rather than a dogma. In this resides its unique value. For this very reason it cannot be bartered away. And yet, for this same reason, it has a flexibility, a capacity for adaptation to new circumstances, which has been hardly yet realised. It is a possession which she holds in trust, and which she may well hope to see finding even larger uses in the future than in the past.

It is surely manifest that within the framework thus indicated there can be a union of Christian order with Christian liberty such as the world has never yet seen. Here is scope for the individual, and ample space for the development of new thought and new methods. One of the most striking things in Christian history is the fruitfulness of the essential elements of our great religion. Out of the seed of spiritual life which is in Christianity there spring an infinite variety of forms. For every fresh development of human existence there is a new shaping of media for the expression of faith and of the instruments of evangelical activity. One especial cause of the divisions of the Church in later times was the rigidity of ecclesiastical institutions and the inflexibility of the ecclesiastical mind. Time after time the new wine burst the old

bottles. Amid the ferment of the present age there is great danger of this happening again, even more disastrously, unless the Church is able to provide a larger and more elastic receptacle than she now possesses.

It is the supreme merit of the policy shaped at Lambeth in 1920 that it shows how this provision can be made. Not that the proposals of the "Appeal" are to be accepted as a final definition of the methods by which unification is to be attained; they are to be considered, rather, as a preliminary statement, indicating the general outlines of the plan, and a possible first step towards its realisation.

The Psychology of Liberty

Before bringing this discussion of Christian liberty to an end, it is necessary to touch briefly upon the bearing of certain recent psychological developments on the whole question of the relation of the individual to the community. The recognition of the individual, with his right of private judgement, is the foundation of liberty. Apart from this recognition, liberty has indeed no meaning. But, according to some recent thinkers, the individual is an unreal abstraction. What he calls his private judgement is the emergence in him of some stream of psychical tendency determined by his heredity and experience. The beliefs of men and their corresponding customs are the results of the history of the race. The dominant element is the inherited instinct of the herd, operating subconsciously, and mainly through imagination. The reason and judgement of the individual are really illusory.

Theories of this kind are essentially destructive of all religion. They deny personality in any sense which secures for man a spiritual existence of his own and a hope for the future. But, imperfectly

grasped, they also supply an apparent justification of those doctrines which have enjoyed a certain popularity in their affirmation of the total subordination of the individual conscience to the mind of the community. To all such theories there is a very plain answer. Whether human belief comes ultimately from the convictions of the individual or from the instinct of the herd is a matter of no consequence from the point of view of our search for truth, because every advance in knowledge, every step in the subduing of natural forces to the uses of human life, every upward movement in civilisation, has been due to the thought and labour of the individual. Each little advance in science takes place because some one human being has arrived at some fresh thought, has discerned its application to some fact in his experience, and has tested it by actual trial. If he finds it to work successfully in trial after trial, he at last becomes convinced of its truth, then conveys his discovery to others, and an addition is made to the whole of human knowledge.

It is this work of the individual which, in all departments of human activity, secures whatever of amenity and well-being man enjoys in his social existence. If it be true that society conditions the life of the individual at all points, it is also true that it is the individual who, by his reaction on society, improves the circumstances of life, whether individual or social. That there are instincts of the herd which well up in the sub-consciousness of the individual no one need care to deny, but it is the use by the individual of his conscious and volitional powers which restrains these instincts, modifies, and directs them. Apart from the mind and judgement of the individual, man would be no higher in the scale than the bee or the ant. It is in the initiative of the individual that there resides the originating force which is continually breaking into the realm of the unknown and

subduing new territories for the empire of the human spirit.

This it is that religion calls the divine image in man, for it is the possession of this creative power which distinguishes him from the rest of the animal creation. It is personality in action, using that characteristic faculty which is the union of feeling, knowledge, and will. And it is in respect of this originating power, which is called into exercise in all the clear decisions of his life, that man is a moral being, knowing good and evil, and choosing between them. Here is the very well-spring of human liberty. To direct aright the stream which flows from it is to effect the salvation of mankind. To endeavour to arrest it is to produce in the end a devastating cataclysm.

Newman, in his *Grammar of Assent*, made a partial use of the range of ideas with which we have just been dealing. He shows—no difficult task—that our beliefs come to us, not, for the most part, as the result of our own independent mind and judgement, but caught up from the world of opinion about us and largely as the outcome of sympathy or through submission to authority. Since Newman's time, this fact has been pressed into the service of a certain type of apologetics by many writers less eminent. But its value has been strangely exaggerated. It is true, of course, that an ordered existence would be impossible if we had to demonstrate by logical process the principles which guide every step in life. We must take the stock of common knowledge for granted : we could not live on any other condition. And what is true in ordinary things is true in the realm of religion and of morals also. Here also we share a common heritage by which we live. But there is one condition which alone makes it possible for an intelligent educated man in a civilised community to do this. It is his knowledge that the critical mind is always at work, and that everything can be brought to the test of

examination at any time. It is just the fact that the individual thinker, with alert mind, is ever on the watch to detect error, and to expose it when discovered, which enables us to trust as we do to the generally accepted stock of principles in all the common arts of life and in the practical applications of science. And the principle which thus comes to light is not limited to these spheres. As Provost Salmon says, "In claiming the right of private judgement, we acknowledge the need of human teaching to inform our judgement. In particular, we own that the teaching of the Church is God's appointed means for the religious instruction of mankind. But the confidence with which we can trust such teaching is altogether proportionate to its willingness to submit to correction." [1]

Summary

It is now possible to sum up the main points of the argument through which our discussion has led us.

We have seen that the great need of the world at the present time both in religious and in social life is an Ordered Liberty. A disorganised world is threatened with dissolution because liberty has become licence, and there is no evidence as yet that such controlling influences are at work as will enable the spirit of man to work out his salvation without destructive violence.

The study of history has led us to see that in the past the Christian Church, claiming monarchy over the whole domain of human life, endeavoured to stifle thought, and thus brought about on the one hand an ecclesiastical terrorism which shocked the conscience of mankind, and on the other a revolt which produced a chaos of individualism.

Yet it was out of this conflict that there sprang that splendid progress of the mind of man which

[1] Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, chap. iv.

gave to the world a fresh civilisation, a magnificent development of science, and a new ideal of political liberty.

The example of science points out the way to the solution of our problem. In this realm the most complete liberty of thought brought about a general agreement, an order never before attained. Liberty, in fact, re-established authority : but it is an authority which must always be ready to submit to correction when fresh knowledge is gained. This harmony is the result of the dominance of a spiritual principle—Reason.

In the realm of religion, the question of authority has been long under discussion. Here Church and Bible have been set in opposition to one another. In modern times both these authorities have been weakened, the one by division, the other by critical methods which have undermined the oracular character of the text.

As regards the Church, its testimony to the Primitive Rule of Faith survives and retains all its old potency. In respect of other questions of faith, its witness is not clear. Holy Scripture also testifies to the same Rule of Faith. Thus these two authorities support one another in that respect which is of greatest importance. But how are we to have guidance as to the application of fundamental Christian principles to the growing needs of mankind and the new problems of every age ?

There is an authority which is superior to both Church and Bible, and to which both bear witness. Christ is the Light of the world. And all modern movements of Christian thought have united in setting forth His pre-eminence. This fact is in accordance with the ancient Scriptural doctrine which sees in Him the Divine Logos, the dominating Word, or Reason, of the whole creative process. In Him, and in His teaching and life, are to be found the solution of the

great problem of the modern world. He can bring liberty and order into harmony.

The great need of the world is the unification of Christian forces, so that, through the Church, the influence of Jesus Christ may be brought to bear upon the life of man. This will have the effect of emphasising the essentials of the Christian Creed and Life, leaving ample scope for liberty of thought and practice.

The plan of Reunion set forth in the "Appeal" of the last Lambeth Conference is in complete accordance with these principles. The adoption of Holy Scripture as the standard of faith, of the Rule of Faith as expressed in the two ancient Creeds, of the two divinely-ordained Sacraments, and the assertion of the need of a ministry universally acknowledged, outline a scheme of unification within which can be included a rich diversity of types of Christian ethos, safeguarded by a firm adherence to the essentials of the faith and of the life which corresponds to that faith.

If this great adventure of the Spirit can achieve some real success, the members of the Anglican Communion will have reason to recognise the Providence which, through long centuries, has kept their Church in the middle path, in spite of the many temptations to wander away from it.

II

ASPECTS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

BY

The Rev. ROBERT H. MURRAY, Litt.D.

RECTOR OF BROUGHTON, HUNTINGDON

AUTHOR OF "ERASMUS AND LUTHER: THEIR ATTITUDE TO TOLERATION," ETC.

SYNOPSIS

The significance of the year 1492.

The mediaeval Church and the mediaeval State.

The manysidedness of the Renaissance.

The grand geographical discoveries of the age with their effect in revolutionising mediaeval preconceived notions. The labours of Columbus and Copernicus.

The altered position of England to (*a*) Europe and to (*b*) America. England is no longer " that utmost corner of the west " (Shakespeare).

The Papacy a Mediterranean Power.

The effect of the New Silver.

The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. The share taken by satirists like Erasmus.

The influence of John Wyclif.

The failure of the Conciliar Movement.

Nascent nationality in England, France, and Spain. The rise of the State with a consideration of its spiritual nature.

The many forms assumed by the Reformation in the different States.

Individualism in Literature and in Life with a consideration of the growth of Conscience.

Sir Thomas More's reading of History and its influence on his policy of toleration.

The *Utopia*.

The position of Parliament and the " Divorce " question.

The Unity of all Life.

The translations of the Bible. The Great Bible, 1539–40 ; Cranmer's Bible, 1540–41 ; and the noble 1611 version.

The Priesthood of the Laity.

The place of the Mass.

Reform by (*a*) Parliament and by (*b*) Convocation.

The Patristic attitude to the State.

Currents and counter-currents. The Act of the Six Articles, 1539. The Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552.

The Marian Persecution and its results.

The character of Anglican Theology.

The continuity of the English Church.

The work of the Popes, notably that of Pius V. and Gregory XIII. The Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, 1570. Papal Approval of Assassination, 1580.

The effects of Roman Catholic Plots in repelling the English from the See of Rome.

The Anglican *via media*.

II

ASPECTS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

If the thirteenth century be the most wonderful the world has seen, surely 1492 is the most wonderful year Anno Domini. Three national monarchs were reigning in England, France, and Spain respectively. Bacon's *tres magi*, Henry VII., Louis XI., and Ferdinand the Catholic, ruled over consolidated kingdoms, the latter in this very year conquering Granada. Then Lorenzo de' Medici died, and with his death France entered upon her part in the creation of international relations in Europe. Thus she came into intimate contact with Spain and Germany, feeling powerfully the influence of Italy. Because of her relations with the last country, France in this fateful year began a career which in the end compelled her to cast in her lot with Latin nations, not with Teutonic, when the Reformation question pressed for settlement. With her England concluded the Treaty of Étaples, marking the rise of modern commerce. In Germany the peasants of Kempten still continued their revolt against feudal oppression. On the other hand, by the influence of Torquemada the Jews were expelled from Spain, and 150,000 had to abandon their homes. The Moors also could this year read their doom of expulsion from the land where they had been settled for almost eight hundred years. The world of 1492 was then composed of mediaeval and comparatively modern

elements. Then, too, Columbus discovered America, and the mind of Copernicus was seething with ideas destined to overthrow the Ptolemaic system.

In mediaeval times the alliance between Christianity and the Empire became so firmly welded that the Church was not *a* State, for it was *the* State. The State as such was merely the secular side of the universal ecclesiastical corporation. The Church took over from the Roman Empire its theory of the absolute jurisdiction of the sovereign authority. It developed this doctrine into the *plenitudo potestatis* of its head, who was the ultimate dispenser of law, the sole legitimate source of all earthly power. There were struggles between the Pope and the Emperor, but the contest lay between two officials, never between two distinct and separate bodies. There was no quarrel between Church and State in our sense of the term ;—this statement is as true of Dante and Marsilius as it is of Boniface and Augustinus. The vice of the mediaeval State—it was also that of the classical—was that it united Church and State in one. The fundamental idea of the mediaeval mind was that of a uniform single empire—it never contemplated the absurdity of several empires—resting entirely upon a Christian basis. The mediaeval basis of unity was undoubtedly religious. No heretic, no schismatic, no excommunicate could possibly enjoy the rights of citizenship. This principle, founded on the Code of Justinian, formed the ground of the claim of the Pope to bind and unloose the allegiance of the subject to the Holy Roman Emperor, a claim that brought almost all his woes upon the head of the unfortunate Roman Catholic. Herbert Spencer teaches us that evolution lies largely in the change from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, but a mediaeval mind could grasp no such conception. Till the days of Machiavelli politics and theology are practically synonymous terms.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that new

birth of the human spirit which we call the Renaissance took place. Man conceived a passionate desire for extending the limits of human knowledge and for employing his powers to newer and better advantage. The general ferment and shaking of men's traditional beliefs extended to all departments of human thought, even to the fundamental questions of society itself. It was towards the close of the Middle Ages that the enormously stimulating influence of Greek art and literature began to remould the world. Admiration for antiquity became the hall-mark of the Renaissance. Art and literature threw off to a very large extent the forms of mediaevalism and looked for all their inspiration to the classical world. The dominant note of the new age was freedom—freedom from the restraints which had been imposed upon men's thoughts and actions by the methods and dogmas of the schoolmen, and freedom to revel in every species of activity which the untrammelled spirit of the ancients had suggested. The free critical methods of the new movements are readily discernible in the doctrines of the time. While, however, each man of letters asserted his freedom to his own opinions, he had but little interest that others should enjoy the same measure of toleration : this forms a marked characteristic of the scholars of the New Learning.

The Effects of Geographical Discovery

While men's minds were thus speculating, the grand geographical discoveries of the age assisted in upsetting the mediaeval preconceived notions as to world-empire. Men indeed, to use M. Taine's picturesque phrase, opened their eyes and saw. They saw the physical bounds of the universe suddenly and enormously enlarged. For the discoveries of Nicholas de Cusa and of Nicholas Copernicus shadowed forth the secret of the universe. The New World, in a

sense not far different from Canning's, did undoubtedly redress the balance of the Old. The New World, or rather the New Worlds, were added to the Old, and the conception of an apparently limitless continent destroyed that of a limited one. Men for the first time got a more correct idea of the globe they were inhabiting. Hitherto they had not even professed to have any knowledge of geography ; there is no mention of it in the Trivium and Quadrivium, which were then supposed to form a cycle of things known, if not of things knowable. Dante had rendered the conception of Hell very vivid, and it constituted a grave obstacle to the work of the navigator. The mediaeval mind placed the happy Isles of the Blessed in the mysterious West, and, illogically enough, located the openings into Hell in the same region. Naturally, sailors did not care to adventure too far from land when such a belief was prevalent. In a mediaeval text-book occurs the question, " Why is the sun so red in the evening ? " and the answer is, " Because he looketh down upon Hell."

A change was passing over the spirit of the age which for a time exercised a subconscious influence pregnant with far-reaching consequences on the work of the Reformation. In 1492 Columbus had pierced the veil which concealed another continent from the eyes of men, and at once the process of transformation began. The centre of Europe had been all-important, whereas now the circumference of the continent assumed this pride of place. As, sixteen centuries before, Corinth and Athens had yielded their position to Rome and Ostia, so now Venice and Genoa fell before the increasing sway of Cadiz and Lagos. It was the same in the north. The Atlantic immediately dominated the new situation, leaving the Baltic and the Mediterranean no more than inland lakes. Men had looked both ecclesiastically and commercially to the south, whereas now they were to look to the north

and the west. Westward ran the course of commerce from Lübeck and Stralsund to Amsterdam and Bristol. The day of such enclosed basins as the Baltic, the Mediterranean, and the Red Sea was over : the day of such marginal ones as the North and China Seas was to come. The historical importance of the Mediterranean and the Baltic was transitory, preparing the way for the Atlantic coast-line. The time taken in the task of preparation was enormous. From the day of the first journey of a Phoenician ship through the Plains of Hercules into the Atlantic to the voyage across it by a Genoese sailor, two thousand years elapsed. It was not, however, the Atlantic that really succeeded the Mediterranean ; it was the broad world-ocean. Significant as the Atlantic coast-line has been, its significance has been enhanced by the circum-navigation of Africa and South America, thereby binding the Atlantic with the world-ocean. The change has been from the Piraeus to Ostia, from Venice to Genoa, from Lübeck to Hamburg, and from the Cinque Ports to Liverpool and Glasgow.

Shakespeare reminds us that England used to be " that utmost corner of the west." Before the Columbian discovery she was at the end of the world, and was regarded as almost out of the world. So her position appeared to the Greek geographers and to the mediaeval monks : the maps of the one and the charts of the other attest this. She had been the outpost of European civilisation, and now she became the very heart of it. Her western situation had been a barrier to her progress, and this barrier was at a stroke transformed into the surest and quickest road to progress. Her limited island area, her tremendous change from pasturage to tillage during the sixteenth century, and her unexploited resources of mineral wealth obliged her to turn to the sea. Conditions at home synchronised with the altered conditions abroad, and her maritime development commenced.

The direction of the expansion has, on the whole, been constantly westward, as Bishop Berkeley indicates in his famous poem. In the south it moved with the Phoenician Sea to the Aegean, then to the Mediterranean, ending with its western shores. In the north it moved from the Baltic to the Northern Sea, and thence across the south. It would almost seem as if every great epoch of history had its own distinctive sea. The Greek had the Aegean, the Roman the Mediterranean. The Middle Ages had the Baltic and the North Sea. The Reformation had the Atlantic, and the cosmopolitanism of our own day revels in the world-ocean. It is hard to the last degree to conceive that in 1492 European man had been over 498,500 years on the earth, and was for the most part unaware of the existence of any continent save his own. The lack of swift means of communication—the railway, the motor-car, the oil-ship, and the aeroplane—left Europe in the throes of birth-pains for a longer period than would now be absolutely necessary. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 was felt only forty years afterwards in the then remote continent of North America, east and west thus beginning to realise the future intimacy of the union between them. It stirred the Portuguese navigators to a renewal of their efforts to reach India by way of the Cape of Good Hope. Every great movement widening the geographical outlook of a people at the same time widens their intellectual and economic outlook. The Crusades effected this important service for the Middle Ages, and the colonisation of America effected it for the seventeenth and succeeding centuries. It is, indeed, difficult not to speak of such an event as the discovery of America almost exclusively in terms of geography. Yet the moment people completely realised there was another continent where the eagle of the Holy Roman Empire had never flown, that moment the whole

structure of mediaevalism was undermined. Columbus discovered a new world beyond, and Copernicus announced new worlds above. Scarcely any discovery of the nineteenth century, not even Darwin's, had such far-reaching effects as these two which made the Reformation possible. What Darwin accomplished in the nineteenth century by his *Origin of Species*, what Newton accomplished in the eighteenth by his *Principia*, Columbus and Copernicus accomplished in the sixteenth.

The Papacy a Mediterranean Power

What the Mediterranean had been in the past the Atlantic was to be in the future. The Papacy had been a Mediterranean Power. The Crusades had been Mediterranean wars. Athens, Rome, Constantinople, Venice, and Genoa had been notable centres in the Middle Sea. The shores of Western Spain, Portugal, England, and Germany were not lapped by its blue waves. The estuaries of the Mersey, the Clyde, and the Lagan resounded to the solitary cry of the bittern and the ripple of the stray fishing-boat.

After the year 1492 the leadership of Europe shifted decisively from the south to the west. As Hegel put it, the crossing of the Alps by Julius Caesar was an event of the same magnitude as the crossing of the Atlantic by Columbus. By both events new spheres were opened out for peoples ready to unfold capacities which were pressing for development. The shores of the Aegean and the Adriatic became what the Breton coast had long been. Cadiz, Lisbon, Cherbourg, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Plymouth, and Bristol were the gates through which the busy traffic poured. The tie of Germany from the tenth to the fifteenth century had been with Italy, that is with the south. Henceforth the tie was

with the north, and with this transfer the rise of Prussia became possible. The cities of Germany soon became aware how closely their fortunes were to be bound up with the success of the Reformation. The boll that has sent forth so many twigs and branches was once a twig itself.

Before the appearance of Sir Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* in 1830, science contemplated changes as catastrophic. Earthquakes, volcanoes, eruptions, and floods were the phenomena ordinarily shaping the world. For these Lyell substituted glacial action, the slow denudation by rivers, subsidence and elevation and the like. In the history of mankind the point of view in Cranmer's day is similar. The attention of the observer was arrested by such a dramatic scene as the Völkerwanderung, or the irruption of the Turks into Europe. As in geology, the mightiest forces are not the vast ones, but the steady, almost imperceptible action of small powers. Nature never makes a leap. Cranmer could scarcely see that the horizontal divisions of the mediaeval world were to be replaced by the vertical ones of the modern world. There was a contracted world for him. There is a world coterminous with nothing less than the boundaries of the globe for the generations after him.

The labours of Colet and Cranmer were in no small degree aided by the geographical, astronomical, and economic revolution which was in process in their time. The opening up of a new continent, the discovery of new planets, and the export to Europe of the new silver created a ferment which left the minds of men ready to receive new impressions. The results of the labours of Columbus and Copernicus are familiar to all, but the part that the muleteer of Potosi played is sometimes overlooked. He was travelling along a steep mountain-side. His mule slipped, and in his anxiety to save himself he clutched at a bush, which yielded a little to his pressure. The

tearing up of some of the roots disclosed a mass of silver, and in this seemingly accidental fashion the metal once more altered the destinies of mankind. In the domain of matter, cause and effect exercise a widespread and wellnigh irresistible influence. The silver comes to Europe, raising prices in a fashion similar to our war prices, making labour dear, and thereby changing the tillage system to pasturage. In the agricultural world men are upset and not a few homeless, and as the cake of custom is irretrievably smashed they are not so unwilling to hear new doctrine as their fathers would have been. It may well be, as the late Dr. J. Gairdner contends, that there was no general hungering and thirsting after truth in the shape of Reformation doctrine; but when is there ever such a hungering and thirsting? Still, there is no doubt that the cake of custom was hopelessly broken, and therefore men like Colet obtained a hearing which, under fifteenth-century circumstances, would have been impossible. The old world which men knew was disappearing, and with its disappearance the old paths were disused. The new world which men knew not was appearing, and with its appearance new paths were used.

The invention of printing gave a guarantee that the work of the men of the New Learning would remain, that the new paths could be now trodden by all, and not, as in mediaeval days, by the select few. True, these paths were still considered to require supervision. For the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* in England was established in 1526, thus preceding the first Index on the Continent by twenty-five years, and that of Rome by thirty-three. Men like Dr. Putnam assume that the censorship of books is primarily ecclesiastical, Papal, in fact, in origin. Such an assumption, however, is wholly unwarranted. As a matter of fact, up to recent times the right of censorship of printed books was inherent in the State simply

because the right to print was a prerogative of the monarch, were he king, viceroy, archbishop, or Pope. When Charles I. proclaimed that "the print is the king's in all countries" he proclaimed the exact truth.

The Share taken by Satire

The soil had been ploughed in many directions, and was ready for any seed that might fall. Foxe records the martyrdom of ten men and women between 1509 and 1518. In the year 1517, for example, there was punishment which fell short of the stake, and thirty-five people in the diocese of London were obliged to recant their views. In 1521 the Bishop of London arrested nearly five hundred for their sympathy with Lollardy. Ammonius, Henry VIII.'s Latin secretary, writes to tell his friend Erasmus that wood is both scarce and dear—and the cause thereof is the holocaust of heretics. The joke is a grim one, but no less grim are the facts to which it bears witness in November 1511. According to Sir Thomas More the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, that stern survey of the state of the clergy, was popular everywhere in England in October 1516. How much satire undermined the prestige of Rome in Europe is plain to all who turn over the leaves of Sebastian Brandt's *Ship of Fools*, the *Vadiscus* and other pungent writings of Ulrich von Hutten, the *Facetiae* and the *Triumphus Veneris* of Heinrich Bebel, and the *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* of Rabelais. Is satire the price which mankind pays for freedom? Its roll of service includes the assaults of Luther on the monks, of Bacon on the schoolmen, of Pascal on the Jesuits, of Butler on the Puritans, of Voltaire and Anatole France on superstition, and of Bentham on lawyers. Shaftesbury was the opponent of enthusiasm, that is fanaticism, which, like all convictions, he would have exposed to the test, not of persecution, but of wit and humour.

These satirists realised the sagacity of this expedient. Their pamphlets circulated on all sides, creating and moulding public opinion. They assumed that the corruption of the clergy in general, and the monks in particular, was a matter known to all. The *Ship of Fools*, for instance, is in reality what Erasmus's *Praise of Folly* is only on the surface. It is a skit on the follies of mankind, whereas the work of Erasmus is, in fact, an exposure of the follies and frauds of those who professed to serve the Church. For this very reason it must be counted among the forces preparing for the Reformation.

In 1511 appeared the *Encomium Moriae* (*The Praise of Folly*). At a time in which printing was yet in its infancy, the first edition appeared with no less than 1800 copies, an enormous issue for those days, yet less than a month after the appearance of the book for sale there were no more than 600 with the bookseller. It was printed more than seven times in the course of a few months. To the monks his satire was as the sword of Gideon, and to all his wit was as the spear of Ithuriel. Fortunate it was for Erasmus that Folly wore such a mask. The lash of Juvenal or Swift is forgotten in the mocking smile of Lucian or Voltaire.

Erasmus satirised follies of all kinds, the student for his sickly look, the grammarian for his self-satisfaction, the philosopher for his quibbling, the sportsman for his love of butchery, the superstitious for his belief in the virtues of images and shrines, the sailor for his folly in praying to the Virgin, and the sinner for his foolishness in believing in the efficacy of Pardons and Indulgences. The king no less than his subjects, the cardinal no less than his clergy, winced at the scourge of this Merry Andrew. To Folly mankind is indebted for all the happiness they enjoy. She not only gives life itself, but all that contributes to its pleasure. At her suggestion woman was created, "a

foolish, silly creature, no doubt, but amusing and agreeable, and well adapted to mitigate the gloom of man's temper by familiar intercourse. Woman owes all her advantages to Folly. The aim of her life is to please man, and this she could not do without Folly. If any one doubts this, he has only to consider how much nonsense a man talks to a woman whenever he wishes to enjoy the pleasure of her society. Friendship, love, marriage, success in life, all are dependent on the aid of Folly."

The main object of Erasmus in writing the book which dissolved all Europe in laughter was the reform of religion. He was, however, wise enough to know that the more subjects he embraced in his popular writing, the more chance there was of its being read. This is evident in the fierceness underlying his ideas. The credulity of the time moves him to indignation, which is not quite in keeping with the light tone Folly deigned to assume. She might laugh at those who calculated with mathematical precision the number of years, months, and hours of purgatory, and at those who fondly believed that they could wipe off a whole life of sin by a small coin. "But what shall I say of those who flatter themselves with the pleasant delusion that they can grant pardon for sins, and who measure out the periods of purgatory, as it were, with time-pieces, meting out centuries, years, months, days, hours, as if by a mathematical table where there could be no possibility of error? Or of those who, trusting to certain little magic marks and prayers which some pious impostor invented either for amusement or with a view to gain, promise themselves wealth, honours, pleasures, abundance, unfailing health, and a green old age, and in the other world a seat next Christ Himself—which, by the way, they would not wish to reach for a long time yet; that is, not till the pleasures of this life, however much against their will and however closely they have clung to them, shall nevertheless have flown

—then they would wish those heavenly joys to follow. Here is a man—say a merchant, or a soldier, or a judge—who thinks that by the payment of a single coin out of his robberies, all the vileness of his life may once for all be swept away, and imagines that so many perjuries, lusts, fits of drunkenness, so many quarrels, impostures, perfidies, acts of treachery, can be redeemed as by contract—aye, so redeemed that he may now return to a new round of crime. But could any frame of mind be more foolish—I mean happier—than theirs who by the daily recitation of those seven verses from the Psalms promise themselves more than supreme happiness? . . . Now, if in this state of things any odious man were to rise up and proclaim what is doubtless true—Thou shalt not perish miserably if thou livest well; thy sins will be forgiven if to thy money thou addest hatred of thy misdeeds, and after that, tears, watching, prayer, fasts, and changest thy whole manner of life; such and such a saint will bless thee if thou wilt endeavour to follow his example—I say, if the wise man should bray out such truths as these, behold of how great happiness he would rob mankind, and into what confusion he would plunge them."

The theologians suffer from the lash of Folly. "They are deeply in my debt, as it is I who bestow upon them that self-love by which they are able to fancy themselves caught up to the third heaven, and to look down upon the rest of mankind as if they were so many sheep feeding on the ground; and indeed they pity their miserable condition, while they are themselves by so vast an array of magisterial definitions, conclusions, corollaries, propositions explicit and implicit, and have so many loopholes of escape, that no chains, though they should be forged on the anvil of Vulcan, can hold them so fast but that they will contrive to extricate themselves; for which purpose they are provided with a number of fine distinctions with which they can cut all knots more easily than the sharpest

axe, and with a vast supply of newly invented terms and words of prodigious length. They are extremely ingenious, too, in explaining the profoundest mysteries of divinity ; as, by what process the world was created and fashioned ; through what channels the plague-spot of original sin was transmitted to posterity ; in what manner, by what degrees, and in how long a time Christ was made perfect in the Virgin's womb ; how accidents can subsist in the consecrated wafer without any substance in which to adhere."

The scholastic system endures much from the lash of the sprite. Its originators " possess such learning and subtlety that I fancy that even the Apostles themselves would need another Spirit, if they had to engage with this new race of divines about questions of this kind. Paul was able ' to keep the faith,' but when he said ' Faith is the substance of things hoped for,' he defined it very loosely. He was full of charity, but he treated of it and defined it very illogically in the thirteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. The Apostles, too, were in the habit of consecrating the Host, which they surely did most religiously ; and yet if they were questioned as to the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem*, the nature of transubstantiation, how the same body can be in different places at the same time, the difference between the attributes of the body of Christ in heaven, on the cross, and in the sacrament of the Mass ; at what moment of time transubstantiation takes place ; whether the prayer through which it is effected is a discrete quantity having no permanent *punctum*, they would not, I fancy, have answered with as much acumen as our Scotists now display in their dissertations and definitions." Folly, all unconscious of her high mission, was lowering the prestige of the orthodox, thereby preparing the way in no small degree for the reformer. Kings and nobles, cardinals and bishops, read the *Praise of Folly* with a delight which would

have been much diminished had they grasped its inner significance.[1]

The Influence of John Wyclif

Mediaeval masterpieces were taken from the shelves to which they were chained. Among these mediaeval masterpieces were the writings of John Wyclif. Professor A. F. Pollard emphasises the extraordinary parallelism between the ideas of this fourteenth-century reformer and those of the Reformation about to be ushered in. Wyclif exalted the royal power to a height which fully satisfied the New Monarchy. He called upon the State to reform the corrupt Church, a call which Henry VIII. was to translate into action. Elizabeth and the statesmen of 1662 were also to experience the urgency of this call. For we may look on the latter year as that in which the Reformation largely came to an end. Then what the greatest of the famous Cambridge three, the late Dr. Hort, termed the experiments in Anglicanism ceased. Wyclif repeatedly regards the Papacy in the form he knew as the most signal manifestation of the spirit of anti-Christ, an attitude to be assumed by Cranmer. Like him, too, Wyclif disliked that abuse of excommunication and its powers which practically turned it into a sort of county court notice. He unsparingly criticised the whole principle of monasticism which Henry VIII. was to sweep away. Wyclif no less unsparingly criticised the ideas which might lead to a social revolution, showing himself at one with the underlying conservatism of the sixteenth century. Though he seemed to regard celibacy as the higher ideal for the clergy, Wyclif pleaded for the permission of clerical marriages, and this is, of course, the tone of the 1549

[1] Here and elsewhere I have incorporated some passages from my *Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration*, by the kind consent of the publishers, the S.P.C.K., which otherwise I must have repeated without advantage in different words.

Act of Parliament. In accordance with the spirit of the sixteenth century, he also pleaded for the place of the preacher, he deliberately used the vernacular, he resolutely appealed to the Bible, and he insisted on popular support for his claims. Time after time he dwelt upon the supreme importance of spiritual religion and the supreme unimportance of mere ceremonies, and here we find the guiding motive of the legislation of Edward VI.'s reign. Wyclif and Erasmus are wholeheartedly in agreement on this point. Wyclif reduced the real presence in Holy Communion to a spiritual presence.

A German traces the growth of his Church to Martin Luther, a Swiss to John Calvin. Herein lie the strength and the weakness of the Lutheran and the Calvinist. On the other hand, the Anglican cannot trace the growth of his Church to any one individual in the same sense that the Lutheran or the Calvinist can. John Wyclif is a great man in the firmament of Anglicanism—that is all. In him the spirit of Puritanism rather than the spirit of Anglicanism is incarnate. There is in him that narrowness of sympathy we sometimes associate with the Puritan of the past. We also note the same uncompromising rejection of mediaevalism as a whole, the same pronounced individualism, the same preference for sweeping change, the same desire for a breach with the past as complete as possible, and the same dislike of tradition. We sorely miss in him that width of sympathy which turned the Church of England into that broad-minded body which constitutes one of her greatest glories. She could be the mother of children so different as Cartwright and Hooker. There is a world between the fierce invective of Wyclif and the sober reasonableness of Hooker. In spite of Wyclif, it was not possible for our Church to effect a break with the past in its entirety. In spite of him, it was not possible to dissolve the tie with the past which

inspires the Prayer Book of Cranmer. Our Church was to contain within its ample bosom Hooker and Herbert, as well as Andrewes and Ken.

The Wyclif of the past and the Erasmus of the present stirred up the feeling that there was something wrong, perhaps fundamentally wrong, with the Church. There had been such a feeling in the fourteenth century, but it had come to nothing. Now there was such a vague feeling again. Now combined with this feeling in the sixteenth century there was added the fact that the universe seemed to be dissolving. Columbus and Copernicus upset or seemed to upset the teaching of the Church. The Church had been proved to be inaccurate where she could be tested. Perhaps she was also inaccurate where she could not be so readily tested. Why was the world so full of unrest? Why was it so difficult to win one's daily bread? Why were wages decreasing and prices increasing? Why were labourers deserting the land and flocking to the town? The situation was not unlike that of our own day. Something was radically at fault, and there sprang up the idea that something must be done. The last cry has probably given rise to as many evils as cures. At the same time, when men utter this cry, there is, as a rule, something gravely at issue. People usually know when they are ill, though their diagnosis of their complaint leaves something to be desired. Was not Rome a centre of evil to the Church? Popes like Alexander VI. or Leo X. were much more the head of an Italian State than the Head of the Church. Why should England be at the mercy of such foreigners, such mercenary foreigners?

Omnia Romae venalia was as true in Henry VIII.'s time as it was in Jugurtha's. Did anything help the reformer in his early days so much as the knowledge that many patriots believed in him? The condition of the Papacy strengthened this feeling enormously.

The Popes, from Sixtus IV. to Leo X., aimed at the creation of Papal States; and they were right, from their point of view, to pursue such an aim. For on the possession of such States depended the permanence of the Papacy. It gave, however, a fatal advantage to English reformers, for they could and did argue that contributions taken from their native land were supporting Italian dreams of conquest. The College of Cardinals, the Curia, the Popes—were they not all essentially Italian in their outlook? Since Julius II., with the single exception of Adrian VI., all the Popes have been Italians. The possession of States placed the Popedom in a contradictory position. They were apostles of peace who were constantly forced to go to war in order to defend their property. They were men of the other world, and yet were they not daily forced to interfere in the affairs of this?

The Conciliar Movement had failed in the past to effect reform and was destined to fail in the future. The growing force of nationality proved too much for any hope of its success. A General Council had been held on the very eve of the Reformation; it was a failure, as all its predecessors had been. When Julius II. convoked it in 1512, men understood that this was a shrewd move in the game of controlling his opponents. It sat from 1512 to 1517, and what had it accomplished? Was Pico della Mirandola wrong in telling the Pope that if there was any real desire for reform, the old laws of the Church would suffice without enacting new ones? Had he not begged the Pope and the assembled Fathers to reform morals? Had there been any result of this speech, which was every whit as remarkable as John Colet's Convocation sermon of 1512? Yes; there had been results, but they were not pleasing to any who had the interests of the Church at heart. For the Fifth Lateran Council, 1512–17, had achieved the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, the charter of

liberties of the Gallican Church. It had confirmed the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, in which Boniface VIII. declared the salvation of men to depend on their submission to the Papal See. It had forbidden, under pain of excommunication and heavy fines, the printing of any books without the approval of the Bishop and the Inquisitor, and in Rome of the Cardinal-Vicar and the Master of the Palace.

Nascent Nationality

Men like Bishop Creighton used to speak of the Reformation as "a great national revolution which found expression in the resolute assertion on the part of England of its national independence." This is only true in part, and is not at all true to the extent that this historian thought. There was some assertion of our national independence, but it was just as much implicit as explicit. There was at the same time the feeling that England should not be at the beck and call of any State, Italian or other. Combined with this feeling there was also the sense of dissatisfaction expressed with the working of the Church by such men as Colet, Dean of St. Paul's. The truth is that the sixteenth-century movement constitutes a testimony to the danger of putting off reform. There might have been a preserving revolution in the thirteenth century instead of the destroying one of the sixteenth. Travellers tell us that in Arctic regions a vessel sometimes lies for a long time firmly bound in a vast field of ice. The sailor who week after week surveys from the masthead the monotonous expanse of whiteness sees an apparently solid surface, motionless and immovable, yet all the time the ice is steadily drifting to the south, carrying the embedded ship with it. At last, when warmer climes are reached, that which in the night seemed a rigid mass is in the light of dawn a tossing mass of ice-blocks, through which the

vessel finds her homeward way. So it was during the sixteenth century. The solid surface was replaced by the tossing, heaving mass. Men vaguely perceived that the old order had come to an end in the State. For after 1492 the nationalities of such lands as England, France, and Spain were unconsciously forming themselves. Subconsciously much more than consciously, this formation was at work. The catastrophe of the Fifth Lateran Council, as it was the catastrophe of the Council of Constance, lay in the fact that national sentiment was waxing while the desire for joint European action was waning. Who, then, understood this vital fact? Ecclesiastical authority was breaking down, and as there must be authority, secular was taking the place of ecclesiastical.

No small part of the labour of the sixteenth century was to effect the substitution of secular for ecclesiastical authority. What Henry VIII. did in England, Philip II. in Spain, Luther did in Germany. The English substitution was fundamentally altered by the Puritans, but Louis XIV. and Joseph II. can trace their descent from their German parent. To Luther as to Althusius, to German thinkers as to Anglican divines, the civil power is indeed a spiritual body. To the reformer the State is no mere police State, no body whose chief duty is to ensure the keeping of contracts. His mind contained in germ the wonderful conception of Edmund Burke that the State is a divine institution. For, according to the Irish thinker, "without society man could not by any possibility arrive at that perfection of which his nature is capable, nor even make a remote and faint approach to it. He, the Divine Author, gave us our nature to be perfected by our virtue. He must therefore have willed the means of its perfection. He must therefore have willed the State, and He willed its connection with Himself the source of all perfection." It is in truth a conception as old as Cicero, and as recent as Hegel, and the powerful

school founded by Fichte and himself. Society is a partnership, an association for the greater purposes of our being, for the promotion of science, art, virtue. "It is," Burke holds with passion, "not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature. It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born."

Bossuet was not wrong in indicating the new domination of the State. What the people gained, said he, in rejecting the Pope was to give themselves a lay Pope, and to place in the hands of the magistrates the authority of the Apostles. That the Reformation aided the cause of despotism is an undoubted fact. Can it be held responsible for the success of that cause? This is as much found in Roman Catholic countries as in Protestant. Was Philip II. of Spain a less absolute ruler than Henry VIII.? In Spain the Church was scarcely less subservient than in Saxony. Indeed, did not Spain owe her success in crushing the movement against absolutism to the close union between the spiritual and the secular arms? The French Church was every whit as obsequious as the German. It is significant that only two bishoprics, Cambrai and Utrecht, vanish from the map before the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648, and both vanish through the action of Charles V.

It is easy to show that the Reformation wore as many colours as the chameleon. It was princely in Germany, it was conservative in England, and it was democratic in Switzerland. This means in reality no more than the fact that the circumstances of each country modified its outward form. It wore an authoritative form in Germany, because Luther was as

much obliged to fall back on the princely classes as the primitive Church was forced to adapt itself to the necessities of the Empire. Whatever charge lies heavy on the memory of the reformer lies at least as heavy on the bishops who consented to give Constantine so much power. It wore a conservative form in England because the Reformation made a special appeal to a class new on a large scale, the middle-class merchants created by the new geographical conditions. It wore a democratic form in Switzerland because opposition to the might of Austria concentrated strength in the hands of the people. At every step there was authority in the foreground or the background.

Individualism in Literature and Life

Fortunate in many matters, the English have not been least fortunate in the spirit of individualism preserved in their literature. If on the one hand the State was growing, on the other hand the individual was also growing. The latter was altogether in keeping with our mediaeval chronicles, which are more outspoken and more expressive of the particular opinions and the particular judgements of the writer than those of other countries in Europe. From the days of Walter Mapes there have always been men more concerned with saying what they would than in being in the line of general opinion. Langland was consumed with the desire of an Englishman who was intent on saying his say on things in general. As Hugh of Lincoln gave Richard I. a good shaking when he refused to listen to him, so Grosseteste hunted Henry III. from place to place, as the king fled from the scolding which he knew was in store for him.

The doctrine of the sovereignty of the individual was fraught with weighty consequences in the sixteenth century, and with almost weightier in its influence on Rousseau, and thereby on the French

Revolution, in the eighteenth. Man emerged from his position as a mere member of the Church or the State, and acquired an individuality of his own. The old order had been the Empire or the Church, the commune, the gild, the scholastic system : the individual is always part of some group, and has no existence apart from it. The new order was the State, the national Church, the merchant, the individual. The old order had been authority and asceticism : the new was authority, but mingled with it there were reason and joy in the whole of life. For a thousand years there had been as much authority in social life as in intellectual. Unknown men had been content to build the cathedrals of the Middle Ages, whereas the men of the new age asserted themselves to the utmost. The thirst for glory became unquenchable. The statues used to be within the cathedral, for they were erected to the glory of God. Now they stood in the market-place to be seen of men. Man used to be bound to a bishop, a lord, a municipality, a school, or a body. Now he proudly steps on the stage as himself, eager to develop his capacities for his own benefit, with boundless confidence in his will, his superiority, and his infinite variety. The body dissolves into the units which compose it. There is no longer the Papacy ; there is the Pope, who is a lord like other lords. There is no longer the city ; there is the prince. There is no longer the university ; there is the spirit of humanism. The painter ceases to depict the group ; the portrait is his masterpiece. He used to describe on the walls of cemeteries the triumph of death ; now he describes on the walls of houses the triumph of life.

The danger of the new individualism is obvious. It is as clear in Wyclif as it was to be in Cartwright. What alleviated the danger was the fresh importance attached to conscience. The most wonderful of all the mediaeval centuries was the thirteenth, and it was

late in that century, as Lord Acton used to point out, that the psychology of conscience was closely studied for the first time, and that men began to speak of it as the audible voice of God that never fails or misleads, and that ought to be obeyed, whether enlightened or darkened, whether right or wrong. Bishop Creighton insisted that conscience had a larger hold of the Teuton than of the Latin or the Slav, and that this formed the strength of the Reformation. "Conscience," he wrote, "was appealed to as the supreme judge, and the intellectual controversy was only an expression of this in the region of theology. I admit that this setting of morality in the foremost place narrowed the scope of religion, and put Christian truth in a secondary place. I admit that it set up a standard of morality which was mainly dictated by social needs rather than spiritual truth. But I think that conscience created the form of religion, not that the theology of the sixteenth century formed a morality."

Clearly if conscience possessed rights, when consciences differed there must be toleration for the differences. The sentiments of *Utopia* are fine, but they are not a whit finer than those of Tertullian, who lived thirteen hundred years before Sir Thomas More. More was not exceptional in advocating the cause of toleration. In the fourteenth century theological thought and intellectual speculation were much more free than in the sixteenth. He had the example of thinkers in the past, and he had also the practice of the present from 1510 to 1530. He was, however, partly old and partly new. In the latter capacity he thought first and last of Truth, while in the former he cared for good and evil. He forms a memorable instance of the truth of Coleridge's aphorism that "he who begins by loving Christianity better than Truth, will proceed by loving his own sect or Church better than Christianity." Toleration was ideal; but what if it brought evil as well as good, if it destroyed the

unity of the Church he loved, if it achieved the disintegration and disaster of his country? When he wrote *Utopia* he had no personal experience of heretics or the assaults they might make on life and property, though his knowledge of contemporary history should have enlightened him. When he became Lord Chancellor, the sack of Rome, the horrors of the Peasant War, and the ideas of the Anabaptists had altered his views. To More civilisation and order were tolerably synonymous terms. He might hold ideas, advanced for his day, upon the distribution of property, the domestic relations, and the like, yet he held firm faith in civilisation based upon Catholicism. His mind realised in part the shock given to the principle of authority by the changes of the fifteenth century, while the whole man did not realise that the social system most urgently demanded reorganisation. Its foundations had been completely undermined by the events of the year 1492, and the stones of the seemingly stately edifice had received a blow from which they could only hope to recover by fresh support.

More's reading of history revealed a past devoid of radical changes. The living organism of human society had worked almost mechanically for hundreds of years. Its members, its circulation, its nervous system, and a sort of skin, consisting of its laws and institutions, seemed still the same. One is not altogether surprised to find that More was unable to see that a simultaneous set of changes had burst the worn-out skin. Dominated by the notion of unity, how could he adapt himself to the alteration from this idea to that of ceaseless flux? The law of status was going, the law of contract was coming. The environment, which had once made a universal Empire and a universal Church necessary, now rendered both an absolute impossibility. Man was no longer immutable, but mutable; one Empire was replaced by many nations. In its essence the Reformation was

individualistic, and by consequence nationalistic. The centre of gravity was shifting from cosmopolitanism to nationalism. It is pathetic to note that More failed to perceive this momentous change while Henry VIII. saw its signs. The noble-minded judge was fighting for an effete mediaevalism, while his egotistic master proved the friend of progress. The tragedy of More's life—it was the tragedy of so many lives of the scholars of the Renaissance—was that he builded not better but *other* than he knew, and set in motion forces whose outcome was destined to fill him with horror.

The Position of Parliament

It is the fashion to proclaim the masterfulness of Henry VIII., and masterful he undoubtedly was. It is worth while pointing out that whatever he did he did with the consent of his subjects. How could he control them? He had neither secret police nor organised bureaucracy. He had only one castle in London, and only a hundred yeomen of the guard to defend it. His whole standing army consisted of the yeomen of the guard and a few gentlemen pensioners. He not only allowed his people to keep arms, but he repeatedly urged them to keep those arms ready for use. Nor did he control Parliament in the fashion commonly imagined. There is not a hint of royal interference in the election of the London members in 1529. True, there was Crown influence in the boroughs, yet this influence was much more active after 1529 than before. In Henry VIII.'s time members in the case of Strode, 1512, established their right to freedom of speech, and in the case of Ferrers, 1543, their right to freedom of arrest. Now and then the king endeavoured to control the course of legislation, but here he experienced the pains of rejection. He tried to effect the passing of the statutes of Wills and of Uses, objects he had much at heart,

yet both were rejected twice at least by the Parliament of 1529–36. In supplies, too, the members were just as resolute. They would only grant one-tenth and one-fifteenth in 1532, a sum which the king refused to take.

The so-called "divorce" question constituted the occasion—not the cause—of the English Reformation. On the morals of the king it is sufficient to quote the judgement of Professor Pollard. We learn that Henry's standard "was neither higher nor lower than that of Charles V., who was at this time negotiating a marriage between his natural daughter and the Pope's nephew; it was not lower than those of James II., of William III., or of the first two Georges; it was infinitely higher than the standard of Francis I., of Charles II., or even of Henry of Navarre and Louis XIV." Had the passion for Anne Boleyn been the main ground for the divorce, there would have been no obstacle to reconciliation after the death of Catherine and Anne Boleyn in 1536. There were doubts of the legality of the king's marriage before Anne Boleyn was born.

The truth is that the death of Catherine's children seemed to Henry VIII. a clear judgement from heaven. He is neither the first man nor the last to make his conscience his accomplice, not his guide. An heir, a legitimate heir, there must be, or the repetition of the Wars of the Roses was inevitable. A divorce was normally an easy matter. Now it was not simply because Catherine was the aunt of the powerful Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V. Was it tolerable that the prospect of disunity within the kingdom on the death of Henry was contingent on the will of the sovereign of another State?

Past precedents suggested the ordinary facility of securing a divorce at Rome. Alexander VI. had divorced Louis XII. from his queen partly because the Borgia Pope was anxious to secure the aid of the French king in securing the interests of his Borgia

family, and partly because Louis was no less anxious to unite Brittany to the French Crown by marrying its duchess. What the Pope had allowed in the case of Louis's queen he ought also to allow in the case of Henry's queen. Besides, had not Henry's own sister, Margaret, and both the husbands of his other sister Mary also secured divorces? Margaret, Queen of Scotland, alleged a precontract on the part of her husband, Angus, which was not proved, and she alleged that James IV. survived Flodden three years, and was alive when she married Angus. She herself was living in open adultery with Henry Stewart, who had procured a divorce to be free to marry his queen. Henry VIII. could hardly help reflecting that at Rome no opposition to either of these divorces was offered. The reason was quite obvious. Neither Margaret nor Angus had an Emperor for a nephew: his wife had, and that was the cause of his undoing. The Emperor himself furnished useful precedents. In 1521 his Spanish Council drew up a memorial on the subject of his marriage, in which the members pointed out that his ancestor, Henry IV. of Castile, had in 1437 married Donna Blanca, by whom he had no children. The Pope then granted him a dispensation to marry a second wife on condition that, if within a fixed time he had no issue by her, he should return to his first. Such a licence for bigamy was precisely what Henry VIII. required. On September 18, 1530, Casale tells Henry: "A few days since the Pope secretly proposed to me that your Majesty might be allowed two wives. I told him I could not undertake to make any such proposition, because I did not know whether it would satisfy your Majesty's conscience." Clement VII. made more than once the proposal that Henry should take a second wife without troubling about the divorce of the first.

The pressure of Charles V. upon Clement VII. was strong enough to prevent the public disgrace of

his aunt. To whom was Henry VIII. to appeal? The power of the General Council had vanished. Still, there was another power, that of the rising Universities, permeated with the spirit of humanism. On the advice of Cranmer the king appealed to them, and some of them registered a verdict in his favour. This occasion of the interference of the Universities disclosed a cause working steadily on behalf of the Reformation in Cambridge. It is usual to maintain that Oxford is the home of movements, Cambridge the home of men. True as this *obiter dictum* is generally, we are not altogether sure that it is true of Cambridge during the sixteenth century. For there were so many men moved by the new spirit of the age that we almost regard them as forming a movement. As early as 1521 a number of Cambridge men regularly met at the White Horse tavern, and the discussions at their meeting turned on the ideas lavishly sent forth by Martin Luther. The inn became known as "Germany" and its frequenters as "Germans." Among these men were Bilney and Barnes, Crome and Lambert, who sealed their faith with their blood; Latimer, the prophet of the movement; and Coverdale and Tyndale, the translators of the Bible. Like Wyclif, Cranmer, and Hooper, Latimer and Ridley asked that the State should take in hand the task of reformation.

The Unity of all Life

In one sense it is true to maintain that religion did not attain so commanding a place in the sixteenth century as in the twelfth. Like Wyclif, the reformers were eager to secularise the wealth of the Church. They felt that life in this world, and the most insignificant employment, when illumined by religion, has in it something of the infinite. Christian ethics till now had a divided ideal. It taught some men

devotion to others and self-sacrifice on their behalf. It taught holiness and righteousness as the ideal of the monk and the nun. The two ideals were parallel and independent. The reformers joined them in the one end of human service. Human life, in its innermost being, is in harmony with the eternal law of morality. No doubt a heavy price had to be paid for the change. For example, the denial of the honour accorded throughout the Middle Ages to virginity had the effect of making the social position of woman wholly dependent on her marriage. The state of poverty was once the sign of a saint : now it was the mark of a failure. Other-worldliness was no longer the motive. A good citizen of this earth was thus preparing for his citizenship in the New Jerusalem. He is a saved man, and his life on earth is as sacred as in heaven. Other-worldliness had rendered men indifferent to the secrets of the Universe, of the ground beneath them and the heavens above them. They had been so preoccupied with the Word of God that they omitted to consider the works of God. The globe acquired a fascination for mankind hitherto unknown.

People had outgrown the conception of the duality of life, and found the new conception of its essential unity. One outstanding effect was the emphasis laid on vocation in relation to daily occupation. The " Saint's Rest " was in the world to come : in this he was to labour at his calling. Business henceforth became a sacred office in which it was a man's bounden duty to do his utmost *ad majorem Dei gloriam*. The reformers were fortunate in the moment in which they launched forth this idea, for Europe was about to change from the agricultural to the capitalistic system. This new industrial form gave rise to an enormously potential revolutionary force. The sanctity of the monastic life was transferred to the trivial round, the common task. Man no longer was made for a function : a function was made for man. The

"religious" were no longer men and women in a monastery: life and religion were now fundamentally one. Formerly it was *orare est laborare*: now it was *laborare est orare*, with the outcome that a justification was at once given to social service, the worth of which the world is only beginning to realise. Formerly there had been a Church in England: now there was a Church of England which embraced all.

Parliament met on November 3, 1529, and inaugurated a series of changes second to none in importance. It settled many matters which do not strictly come within the scope of our subject. Here, however, it is hard to draw a line. For the dissolution of the smaller monasteries and the consequent redistribution of the national wealth were in accordance with the spirit of the new age. At the end of its sittings of almost seven years the separation from Rome was complete, and the royal supremacy over the English Church, "so far as the law of Christ allows," established. Some of the main steps in the process of separation from Rome were the declaration that all the clergy were liable to the penalties of praemunire (1531), that the payment of annates, or first-fruits and tenths of benefices, to Rome was forbidden (1532), that the clergy were no longer allowed to legislate (1532), that all appeals to Rome were forbidden (1533), and that all Papal authority in England was annulled (1534). The element of negation is prominent in this work. It is an element not only in the Reformation, but also in every revolution ever made. Did not the constitutionalists of 1789 begin by demolishing feudalism before they could raise the building of fraternity and equality?

The Translations of the Bible

Positive work was set on foot. The Great Bible was issued in English in two editions in 1539 and

1540; Cranmer's Bible in six editions in 1540 and 1541. With English translations it was possible to lay down the idea that the literal meaning, not the allegorical, was the one to be sought. Erasmus fought "absolutely the opinion of those who refuse to the common people the right to read the divine letters in the popular language, as if Christ had taught unintelligent mysteries, understood only by some theologians. . . . I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey." Erasmus wrote a series of Latin paraphrases of all the books of the New Testament except the Revelation of St. John the Divine. These were meant to bring home to the reader the substance and thought of the several books in a form making a ready appeal to his mind. No one, not even Wyclif, with his translation of the Scriptures, contributed so much to the Englishman's knowledge of the Bible as these *Paraphrases of the New Testament.* They diffused the opinions of the author of the *Praise of Folly* on such matters as fasts and feasts, the monastic life, the worship of relics, and the like. Authority received rude blows from comments like those on Matthew xvi. 18, "Upon this rock I will build my church." The author expresses his surprise that these words should be applied exclusively to the Roman pontiff, "to whom they undoubtedly apply first of all, seeing that he is the head of the Christian Church; but they apply, not to him only, but to all Christians." It was not a little difficult for the husbandman, the weaver, the traveller to distinguish between text and paraphrase, between St. Matthew and St. Erasmus. The blending of the two renders intelligible the belief, not only in England but in Europe, that the Bible was composed as a pamphlet on the reforming side. It was, in fact, directed from its

origin, the only origin at least the ordinary man knew, against the Pope and the Romish Church.

It came as a shock of surprise to the reader to note that in the Bible St. Peter made mistakes and was rebuked accordingly, thus showing little sign that either he or his successors were infallible. It was hard to think that the extortionate cardinals were in the line of succession from one who had neither silver nor gold. It was no less hard to see in the New Testament the precedents for the worship of the Virgin Mary or the Saints, the celibacy of the clergy, the use of Indulgences, the veneration of relics, and the like. Between the purity and the simplicity of the meeting in the upper room in Jerusalem and the then growing artistic and architectural beauty of St. Peter's there was a difference sufficient to provoke inquiry.

The appeal to the Bible was the soul of the Reformation generally and of the English Reformation particularly. The Renaissance left the people untouched : the Reformation touched them deeply, and it touched them through the sacred record. Between Rome and the people there stands not only the might of the sovereign, but also the Bible. The place of an infallible Church was taken by an infallible Book. The change was gain, but not all pure gain. The Bible belongs to a past age and records many types of civilisation. It records principles : it refuses to record maxims for the indolent or for those who prefer authoritative rules to guide every action of their life. Therefore the reader must interpret it anew in the light of the present. Its truths are unchanged : its aspects are continually changing. That is, its interpretation must vary from age to age. The reformer asserted the priesthood of the faithful, and this assertion carried with it the right to examine for oneself, regardless of any *Ita scriptum est*. The interpretation of the Bible was left to the ever-varying necessities of the individual. Men were convinced that the salvation of

each soul was dear in the sight of God, and they were convinced that nothing, and no one, must stand between the soul and its Creator. Thereby they got rid effectually of priesthood in the old sense, and thereby they broke the monopoly of the Church of Rome.

There were to be many translations of the Bible before the extraordinarily fine one of 1611 appeared. As we read it, we are apt to forget that it is only in our tongue that it holds this pride of place. A Frenchman does not usually look at his Bible, and cannot buy his Vulgate as reasonably as we do our version. A German is apt to treat his Lutheran version as a document in philology, not the model of style our own is. Matthew Arnold made us aware of a certain congruity of sentiment with the Hebrews which has led us to adopt their patriarchs and rulers for our own. The supreme superiority of our 1611 version is due in part to this consonance of character. It is significant that the early religious literature of the Romance languages, whose versions of the Bible are so inadequate, consists mainly of hagiology, while our own is made up of translations and paraphrases of the Bible. It is no less significant that no complete translations of it were made till religion entered into the marrow of politics. There is a certain gravity in tone in our best literature, there is an elevation of sentiment—a picturesqueness of sentiment—lacking in the Romance tongues, and there is a custom of allusion, a custom of employing suggestive rather than logical exposition—and these traits come in no scanty measure from our translation of the Bible. The historian is bound to note these traits in our national character, and he is also bound to note their source. He also perceives that the political roots of our Colonial Empire lie deep in the antagonism of ourselves and the Dutch to Spain with its Pope-given dominion of the world.

The Priesthood of the Laity

The reformers rediscovered the doctrine of the priesthood of the laity. At once the believers became Popes with the infallible Word of God in their hand. The Fathers emphasise the priesthood of the faithful just as much as the men of the sixteenth century. Ignatius and Polycarp make no mention of a sacrificial priesthood. Justin Martyr, for example, points out that all Christians "are the true high-priestly race of God."[1] According to Irenaeus, "all the righteous possess the sacerdotal rank"[2] and "all the disciples of the Lord are Levites and priests." Tertullian, when a Montanist, asks, "Are not even we laics priests?"[3] He uses the terms presbyter and sacerdos interchangeably. In the same strain Origen inquires if the layman knows his privileges. "Dost thou not know," he demands, "that the priesthood is given to thee also, that is, to all the Church of God and the people of believers?"[4] He constantly speaks of the true Christian as a priest.[5] According to Jerome the priesthood of the layman is his baptism.[6] St. Augustine maintains that "He gives the name priesthood to the very people whose priest is the mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus."[7]

This doctrine had consequences in the world of politics just as much as in the world of religion. How could the English reformers debar the faithful from a voice in the State when they allowed them a voice in the Church? For if they were fitted to be entrusted with eternal affairs, were they not fitted to be entrusted with temporal? As the doctrine of justification by faith bestowed free pardon on believers, their God was their Father. Since He was not a despot, their king could not be one. How could Cranmer allow the

[1] *Dial.* 116 ff. Cp. *Tryph.* 117.
[2] *Haer.* IV. viii. 3; v. xxxiv. 3.
[3] *De Exhort. Cast.* 7.
[4] *In Lev. Hom.* ix. § 1.
[5] *Ibid.* iv. 6; vi. 5; ix. 1, 8; xiii. 5.
[6] *C. Lucif.* 4.
[7] *De Civ. Dei*, XVII. v. 5.

sovereignty of conscience and refuse his followers all share in the sovereignty of their country ?

The Mass

The new attitude to the Bible and to the conception of the priesthood of the laity was among the characteristic changes at work. There was, however, no change so far-reaching as that which affected the attitude to the Mass. There was no English theologian during the reforming century of the same rank as John Calvin, and for this we may, from one angle, feel thankful. For it means that we are not wedded to Calvinism or indeed any -ism. At the same time the views of Cranmer on transubstantiation are so important that we dwell on them. He rejected not only the Papal but also the Lutheran and the Zwinglian views. He himself held that " as the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord's supper, so is the very body of Christ inwardly by faith eaten indeed of all them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do, which eating nourisheth them into everlasting life." [1] The Supper was God's work for man. The moment it received a sacrificial value it became man's work for God. No one was better aware than Cranmer that the Mass was the one thing that mattered. True, the Church proclaimed the love of God, the atonement of Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost. In practice, however, her whole life turned on the Mass : the altar was as much the centre of the parish church as its doctrine was the heart of Church life. Only the Church possesses the Mass, only the Church can offer the Body and the Blood of Jesus. Inevitably corporate life prevailed over individual. Just as inevitably there was, in Cranmer's judgement, the tendency to make the objective element grow at the expense of the subjective. The priest absolved the sinner : that was

[1] Cranmer, *Works*, i. 17.

objective. Could he be sure that the sinner was truly penitent? It seemed to men like Cranmer that instead of Christ being the one mediator between God and man, the order of the priesthood stepped in. The Mass, then, was the tremendous obstacle to true religion; it, and it alone, mattered. Were it swept away, all attempts at mediatorship save that of the Saviour were swept away with it. Then between God and man there was none to interfere. God bestowed upon the sinner the gift of pardon and peace, constituting him a member of that priesthood to which all the faithful belong.

Now it is sometimes argued at the present day that the Church—not the State—ought to have reformed herself. Such a view is an anachronism. For it presupposes that there was a national Church before the days of Cranmer whereas there was nothing of the sort. Even if Convocation had undertaken such a task—and it is a weighty "if"—men like Sir Thomas More would have offered as stout opposition to its work as they offered to the work of Parliament. The truth is that men at the time who objected, objected not to the way the Reformation was accomplished as to the fact that it was accomplished at all. The fact—not the fashion of the fact—was the outstanding question.

The Patristic Attitude to the State

Another matter deserves attention, and that is the nature of the State. If it possesses, according to Burke, a partnership in all that concerns the higher life of men, it is difficult to note reasons why it may not take its share in the raising of national life to a higher level. To our mind this forms the essential justification of State action. There are minds, however, to whom the argument from precedent furnishes a strong appeal, and therefore we consider the patristic attitude. This point of view was influenced by

Seneca, who regarded government as due to the increase of vice.[1] Persecuted as the Christians were in the first century, Clement of Rome directs the Corinthians to submit themselves to their "rulers and governors upon earth."[2] Polycarp meets Ignatius on his way to martyrdom; still the latter asks his followers to "pray also for kings and powers and princes and for them that persecute you and hate you."[3] The early liturgies attest how faithfully these directions were obeyed.[4] The apologists naturally employed arguments drawn from this obedience in their defence.[5] Irenaeus follows, perhaps unconsciously, Seneca, and anticipates the Fathers of the sixth and seventh centuries in looking on government as the consequence of man's corruption and as a remedy for this corruption. "They (*i.e.* men) might attain to some degree of justice, and exercise mutual forbearance, through dread of the sword plainly set before them."[6] Government of man in a state of innocence is dispensable: to man in a fallen state it is indispensable. He refers to the verse in Proverbs,[7] "By me kings reign, and princes administer justice," and the views of St. Paul in the epistle to the Romans,[8] "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." Passages like these satisfy him that authority ultimately comes from God, that He subjected men to the rule of their fellow-men in order to compel them to some measure of righteousness and just dealing. How far this is removed from the mediaeval conception is obvious in the pages of St. Thomas Aquinas, who, in regarding government as the necessary instrument of perfection for mankind,

[1] Cf. *Epist.* 90, §§ 38 ff., § 46.
[2] Clem. lx., lxi.
[3] Polyc. *Ad Phil.* xii.
[4] Const. *Ap.* viii. 12.
[5] Just. Mart. *Apologia*, i. 17; Tertullian, *Apologia*, 30, 39, *Ad Scap.* 2; Arnob. iv. 36; Athenagoras, *De Leg.* xxxvii.; Dion. Alex. *ap.* Eus. *H.E.* vii. xi.; Theophilus, i. 11.
[6] *Adv. Haer.* v. 24.
[7] Prov. viii. 15.
[8] Rom. xiii. 1.

approximates to the classical ideal.[1] At the end of the second century Irenaeus plainly considers civil authority binding on all. If the ruler be unjust, God will punish him : resistance is unlawful.

Though Theophilus of Antioch refuses to worship the king, still he is to be "reverenced with lawful honour, for he is not a god but a man appointed by God, not to be worshipped but to be judged justly. For in some respect his stewardship is committed to him by God."[2] Justin Martyr, another second-century writer, insists that Christ ordered His followers to pay their taxes, and quotes His words on the duty of rendering to Caesar the things which are Caesar's. For while they can only worship God, in all other ways they gladly serve their rulers.[3]

There is much in common between the thought of Theophilus of Antioch and Clement of Alexandria, who considers that the sovereign ought to rule according to the laws.[4] To the same school of thought belong the ideas of Origen, who thinks that the Church is more divine and more necessary than the State, justifying the refusal of some Christians to serve in the army or in public offices.[5] The old conception, however, prevails in St. Optatus of Milevis, who has to face the results of the Donatist schism in North Africa. The Church is torn in twain. What is more natural or more obvious than to confront the schismatics with the authority of the Empire? Of course the Donatists protested that the Emperor stood outside matters ecclesiastical. Against this protest Optatus set the conception that the ruler is the representative of God on earth. Did not St. Paul command Christian men to offer up prayers for kings and those set in authority? It is quite true that the Empire is not in the Church, nevertheless, to Optatus as to

[1] Cf. *De Regimine Principum*, *passim*.
[2] *Ad Autolycum*, i. 11.
[3] *First Apology*, 17.
[4] *Strom.* i. 24. Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Prima Secunda*, qu. xc,
[5] *Contra Celsum*, viii. 73-75.

Ambrose the Church is in the Empire. There is no one over the Emperor save God only, who made him Emperor.[1] The day when Constantine was to be the patron and protector of the Church was in sight, and the protests of Donatus were unavailing.

The fall of Adam dominates the thought of St. Ambrose, who conceives that the task of government is divine, for it is the sovereign remedy for sin. According to him the authority of rulers is imposed on the foolish in order that they, no matter how unwillingly, may obey the wise.[2] The Emperor is the son of the Church.[3] It is an easy transition to St. Augustine, who entertains the same conception of the functions of the State.[4] Like St. Optatus, he firmly holds that the ruler is the representative of God. True, there are emperors as evil as Nero, but even such as he receive their power through the providence of God, when He judges that any nation may stand in need of such governors.[5] The State may be a *grande latrocinium*. It may also, when Christian, merge itself in the Church.[6] The civil power thereby becomes the servant of the Church, and its officers obey her behests. Indeed, the ecclesiastical society takes the place of the *civitas superna*,[7] and becomes the only true earthly *civitas*.[8]

The conception that the ruler represents God grows. To Ambrosiaster the king is reverenced on earth as the "Vicar of God." He has "the image of God as the bishop has that of Christ."[9] Clearly to this writer the sovereign receives his authority directly from God Himself, a standpoint familiar to Cranmer. From the time of Constantine, the Emperor was regarded as invested with a certain spiritual

[1] *De Schisma Donatistarum*, iii. 3; Ambrose, *Ep.* xxi. 36; *Enarr. in Ps.* xxxvii. 43.
[2] *Epist.* xxxviii. 8. [3] *Ibid.* xxi. 36; *Enarr. in Ps.* xxxvii. 43.
[4] *Quar. Prop. ex Ep. ad Rom.* 72; *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 15.
[5] *De Civ. Dei*, v. 19, 21. [6] *Epist.* cv. 5, 6. [7] *Serm.* ccxiv. 11.
[8] *Epist.* cxxxvi. 16, 17; cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 21.
[9] Ambrosiaster (pseudo-Austin), *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, xci. 35.

character and authority.[1] He was acknowledged, at least by those who considered him orthodox, to possess the right of taking a prominent part in ecclesiastical affairs, of summoning councils, proscribing heresy, and imposing the true Faith on his subjects by his sovereign word. His person, acts, and letters were characterised as "sacred"; his office was a divine creation. Did not his authority spring directly from the Deity?

No one was more impressed by the feeling of reverence for the Emperor than Gregory the Great. In the spirit of Cicero,[2] he holds that men are equal, but they are different in condition as a result of sin. As all men do not live equally well, one man must be ruled by another; there is a brutal tendency in mankind which can only be repressed by fear.[3] In the same fashion as both St. Augustine and St. Isidore of Seville, he wrestles with the problem of the bad ruler.[4] To Gregory the sovereign was the Lord's anointed, God's earthly representative. What, however, was the duty of the subject if the Emperor did not live in conformity with his high calling? To him the path of duty is plain. The ruler, good or evil, must be reverenced as the minister of God, who bore His sword. Is any proof of this standpoint required? In that case the Old Testament furnishes clear guidance. Was not Saul an evil king? Was not David a good subject? And yet did not David refuse to lay his hand on the Lord's anointed? Gregory the Great saw no opposition between *Ecclesia* and *Republica*, though he plainly perceived the opposition between *Ecclesia* and *Saeculum*, or the world. Caesar was to confine himself to the things which were Caesar's. He had, however, a concern with the things of God when the law and order of the Church were exposed to danger.[5] Good subjects will not

[1] Euseb. *De Vita Constant.* i. 44, iii. 10; Mansi, xi. 6; xii. 976.
[2] *De Leg.* i. 10, 28; 12. 33.
[3] *Exp. Mor. in Job* xxi. 15.
[4] *Libri Moralium in Job* xxv. 16.
[5] *Epist.* xi. 29.

even criticise rashly or violently the conduct of even bad rulers ; for to resist or offend against a ruler is to offend against God, who has set him over men.[1] Patristic authority is clearly on the side of kingly authority even when it comes to a reform in the state of the Church. Such authority Henry VIII. masterfully employed, though he only employed it for a season.

Currents and Counter-currents

The large currents flowing from such sources as the discoveries of Columbus and Copernicus, the rise in prices, the change from tillage to pasturage, the spread of the Renaissance, the influence of satire, the growth of individualism, the fresh translations of the Bible, the doctrine of the priesthood of the laity—matters of this varied type modified the gradual rising or fall of the tide of Reformation beliefs. This tide did not exert absolute or despotic authority any more than Henry VIII. did. Its power has always been diminished by the existence of counter-currents or cross-currents of opinion which were not in harmony with the prevalent opinion of the time. A counter-current here means a body of belief or sentiment more or less directly opposed to the dominant opinion. There was a counter-current in 1539 when the reactionary Act of the Six Articles passed Parliament. There was a counter-current of another order when the first Prayer Book was published in 1549, and there was yet another counter-current when the second Prayer Book was published in 1552. We note throughout the sixteenth century that kind of conservatism which prompts men to retain convictions which are losing their hold upon the mass of men, and it is to be found as much among the adherents of one religious or political creed as of another. There is,

[1] *Regulae Pastoris*, iii. 4 ; *Mor.* xxii. 56 ; xxv. 34 ff. Cf. Gregory of Tours, *Hist. France*, v. 19.

especially in England, that intellectual and moral conservatism which always exerts the modification of the main current by the cross-current or the counter-current. The past, do what we will, controls the present.

In the first Prayer Book Cranmer employed such liturgical material as the Sarum Use, which formed its basis, the Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, the Lutheran Service-books, and indeed all the contemporary liturgies he could find. The outcome was a piece of work which was too conservative to please some of the reformers. There was another cross-current when the second Prayer Book appeared in the year 1552. There was the sequence of the Mass in the 1549 book: there was the Holy Communion Office in the 1552 book. The word "altar" was now, significantly enough, expunged. Our Prayer Book reflects clearly the craftsmanship of Cranmer. There were mighty forces moving the world which he felt he was unable to control. These forces left their impress on his susceptible mind, deepening his sympathy, making him realise his own helplessness. This sympathy of the man and this sense of dependence on God are to be felt in every word of his exquisite and plaintive Litany, which appealed to men's hearts in those days of unrest with a pathos well-nigh past our power of comprehension. Cranmer indeed turned the old liturgies into English in a fashion which amounts to genius. The learning of the English clergy at one time and the breadth of the Church of England at another, move the world to admiration. There is, however, nothing in our Church of more priceless value than our Prayer Book. In it there is that blending of old and new, the prayers of the past combined with the needs of the present, which was of the very essence of our Reformation. The Prayer Book is the common book of the English Church, and it is no less the common book of the English people. It is endeared to them by a thousand associations, private as well as public. Its praises no less than

its prayers, its modest aspirations no less than its wonderful devotional spirit—these are the possessions of our race. The generations come and the generations go: the Prayer Book remains, and to-day the whole Anglican Communion breathes its spirit.

From the day Mary I. ascended the throne on July 19, 1553, to the day of her death on November 17, 1558, there was a strong cross-current flowing. Catherine de' Medici warned her son, meditating the massacre of the Guises, that the merit is not in the way you cut a thread, but in the way you sew it. She was a contemporary, a wary contemporary, of Mary I. Our queen was simply so intent on cutting the thread that she utterly neglected the way of sewing it. The thread must be cut, and must be cut forthwith—that was all she considered. She did not consider that truth to which Tertullian bore such witness when he laid down that "the blood of martyrs is a source of life." Their blood was no dead matter: it was the seed of certain life. The fact is that the heart of the English nation never went out to the Reforming movement until the Marian martyrs died at the stake. The number of those who sealed their testimony with their blood fell short of three hundred, but among them were the very elect of the reformers. The story, the heroic story, of the martyrdom of Cranmer—as Professor Pollard has shown with a wealth of psychological insight—the story of Ridley and Latimer—these stories, when told by the cunning hand of Foxe, left the deepest impression on the people at large. With perfect truth a lady wrote to Bonner, "Within a twelvemonth you have lost the hearts of twenty thousand rank Papists."

The progress of the Reformation had taken place in spite of persecution: perhaps one may say the progress occurred in part on account of persecution. For it is impossible to believe half-heartedly when the stake is the penalty. There were Englishmen—aye, and Englishwomen—whose faith waxed strong as the

flames leaped around them. There is a fierce joy in enduring keen pain for a creed that is dearer than life. From this standpoint, force is a vital condition of all religious beginnings. Under its influence loose ideas become firm, and the vacillator turns resolute. It is possible that the relaxation of persecution is partly the reason of the scepticism of our own day. Our faith is wavering because we are not liable to suffer death for it. Similarly during the war there was many a fervent patriot in the trenches and at home who ten years ago was lukewarm in his loyalty.

The Character of Anglican Theology

It is worth while remarking that the reading of Anglican theology, and especially that of its opponents, is beset with grave difficulty even down to so late a date as 1662, the last year the Prayer Book received serious revision—though indeed the Churches in communion with the Church of England are always revising it. No little of this difficulty arises from the fact that the art of grasping a point of view opposed to one's own is not at all common till the last century. Formerly a writer was exhausted by the effort of making out his own meaning, aided by his friends. The definition and the comparison of differing systems of thought which occupies us so largely in our own time was unknown, and everybody who differed from a thinker was supposed to differ very vitally indeed. Walter Bagehot held that when we have stated our terms and cleared our ground, all controversy is, for the most part, either superfluous or useless. Such a position very few men took up before the nineteenth century. Another matter in our theology deserves attention, and that is its quality of moderation, which, of course, comes out specially in Hooker's writings. Moderation, saving moderation, was the salvation of the English Reformation. The flames of Smithfield in 1558 consumed

men's bodies, but they no less consumed their desires to go to extremity in either the direction which Mary I. urged or even that which John Calvin urged. There was a width of view and there was a singularity of caution which ultimately gave to Anglicanism that tone of moderation which so emphatically distinguishes it. It is but fair to say that here we recognise the share taken by the genius of Elizabeth. It is safe to say, for instance, that not a few of the Elizabethan reformers believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Yet all our Articles commit us to is the statement that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." There is nothing to bind us to the view that all the Bible is Holy Scripture. Similarly, not a few of the Elizabethan reformers were Calvinists, yet it is true to say that Calvinism was not binding on the English Church. Baptism, too, we learn is "in very good accord with Christ's institution," but we do not learn that it is Christ's institution. The revisers of our Prayer Book in 1662 believed, for the most part, that episcopacy was *de esse* of the Church, yet all we are committed to is the conviction that it is *de bene esse*.

Down to the year 1570 there was no idea on the part of the English that any new Church had come into being, for as a matter of fact no such Church had been created. There had been changes in the ceremonies of the Church : there had been none in her creeds. Clergy and people, down to the day when Pius V. deposed Elizabeth, attended the same parish church they had always attended. Then, no doubt, some broke away from the Church they had known and loved. Kitchin was, for example, Bishop of Landaff from 1545 under Henry VIII. to 1563 under Elizabeth. Goodrich and Thirlby were bishops in the days of Henry VIII. and they were no less bishops in the days of Mary I. It is true that our Church submitted to the See of Rome under Henry VIII., and refused to submit any longer. It is also true that our Church submitted

to the See of Rome under Mary I., and refused to submit any longer. Unquestionably it was the same body after the refusal of Henry VIII. to submit to this jurisdiction as it was the same body after the consent of Mary I. to submit to this jurisdiction.

On the continuity of the Church of England there is almost nothing half so impressive as the unbroken row of Registers which we have seen on the shelves of Lambeth Library. J. R. Green used to point out that we possess another set of documents equally continuous —those which record the presentations to livings. Bishop Stubbs remarked to J. R. Green that you might read these through and hardly guess that any ecclesiastical change had accompanied the English Reformation. There are, of course, verbal differences, but not more extensive than those which appear in the extant Consecration-Deed of Parker. The matter, J. R. Green proceeds to explain, is simple enough—a registrar or lawyer whose daily business is drawing up documents by precedent alters just as little as he can, and naturally under Elizabeth there were grave reasons why queen and primate were thoroughly at one in this matter.

The Work of the Popes

Pius IV. passed away in January 1566, and was succeeded by the saintly Pius V. His character is evident in his remark when friends and physicians urged him to take care of his health. His answer was that God had placed him where he was to take thought for others, not for himself. England at once occupied his thoughts. On February 5, 1570, the cause of Queen Elizabeth was opened before the judicial authorities of the Apostolic Chamber, on the 12th the hearing of evidence came to a conclusion, and on the 25th judgement was entered "against Elizabeth, pretended queen of England, and her heretical followers." Canon law lays down that a prince ought

not to be excommunicated without previous warning, and, after excommunication, ought not to be deposed unless within a year he has not obtained nor even sought release from excommunication. The verdict pronounced against our queen obviously violates the forms of law. The Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, 1570, styled Elizabeth *praetensa Angliae regina*, yet the Pope's predecessor, Pius IV., tried again and again to enter into diplomatic relations with this "pretended" queen, his brief of 1560, for instance, giving her the royal title. Other points were not a little singular. The Bull of 1570 states that Elizabeth was the Supreme Head of the Church. Her father had laid claim to this title, but she had been at pains to drop it.

Hardly any fact in the whole sixteenth century so altered the attitude of the average Englishman to the See of Rome as the publication of this Bull. Henry VIII. had resented the fact that his "divorce" depended on the relationship of Charles V. to his wife. That, however, was largely a personal matter, which affected some—not all—Englishmen. All now were deeply affected when they noted that a distant potentate claimed to release them from their allegiance to their own rightful queen. England was fast becoming a national State, and its nascent nationality leaped to fever-heat when men realised that a Power—an outside Power—claimed to control their national destinies. Stubbe was a Puritan—and a lawyer at that—and he entertained views of his own on the expediency of a marriage between his queen and the Duke of Anjou. With hearty loyalty he set forth his ideas in his pamphlet, *Gaping Gulph, in which England will be swallowed up by the French Marriage*." For writing this pamphlet he received sentence to have his right hand cut off. It was an abominable sentence. Pius V., however, would have learnt much had he been present when the penalty was carried out. Taking off his hat with his remaining left hand, Stubbe called

out, "Long live Queen Elizabeth!" The memory of the excommunication of 1570 long remained. We have rarely read a pamphlet dealing with the Roman Catholic question in any shape throughout the WHOLE seventeenth century which did not contain a reference to Popes who freed men from their oaths, who freed subjects from their allegiance. Mr. T. G. Law termed the excommunication of Elizabeth "the supreme effort of the counter-Reformation." It was an effort which completely failed, and recoiled with grave effect on the head of Pius V. and with graver effect on the fortunes of the men who persisted in adhering to his Communion in England.

Papal Approval of Assassination

Directly Pius V. had failed, it was reserved for his successor, Gregory XIII., to try indirect methods. He emphatically believed that assassination, when employed in the service of his Church, was a work well-pleasing to God. Till lately, almost all the evidence at our disposal was the doubtful avowal of men like the Jesuit Tyrel in 1581. In the spring of 1583 the nuncio Castelli at Paris wrote to Cardinal Tolomeo Galli (called, from his birthplace, the Cardinal of Como) that he refused to lay before Gregory XIII. a plan for the assassination of Elizabeth which had been placed before him, "for although I believe everything would be lawful to the pope by which God might chastise His enemy [Elizabeth], still it would be unseemly that His earthly representative [the Pope] should do it by such means as this." The cardinal communicated the contents of the letter to Gregory XIII., and wrote at his orders: "His Holiness can only feel pleased that that kingdom should be set free from oppression by whatever means (*in qual si sia modo*) and restored to God and our holy religion." Grave as these words are, they do not

quite amount to an approval of assassination. Nor does the Plenary Indulgence granted to Dr. Parry during the winter of 1583–84 amount to approval. He was granted this Indulgence in order to carry out a dangerous ill-defined undertaking with the object of restoring England to her former state of obedience to the See of Rome. The act of restoration seemed to involve the decease of the queen.

Unmistakable evidence is now forthcoming in a hitherto unknown letter of the Cardinal of Como to the nuncio in Madrid, Filippo Sega, which Dr. A. O. Meyer has published in his able book on *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth*.[1] In 1580 an Englishman, one Humphrey Ely by name, appeared at the nunciature in Madrid. He came in order to know if he could secure approval for the plan of some English nobles and some English Jesuits to murder Elizabeth. The precise point was, Did they, by the removal of the queen, thereby commit sin? Filippo Sega reassured their minds. Did not the Bull of Excommunication of Pius V., of blessed memory, give leave to all the queen's subjects to take up arms against her? In order to make assurance doubly sure Sega promised to write to Rome on the matter. In the meantime he eagerly assured the conspirators that if they executed the deed before Papal approval arrived they would receive the necessary absolution afterwards. The matter was so urgent that it brooked no delay.

The reply of the Cardinal of Como to the nuncio Sega conveys plain approval of the assassination of Elizabeth. Nor does it in any whit lighten the guilt of Gregory XIII. that he does not speak directly with his own lips but through those of his prime minister and confidant. Here is part of the damning letter. "Since that guilty woman of England rules over two such noble kingdoms of Christendom and is the cause

[1] Pp. 271, 489-91.

of so much injury to the Catholic faith, and loss of so many million souls, there is no doubt that whosoever sends her out of the world with the pious intention of doing God service, not only does not sin but gains merit, especially having regard to the sentence pronounced against her by Pius V. of holy memory. And so, if those English nobles decide actually to undertake so glorious a work, your Lordship can assure them that they do not commit any sin. We trust in God also that they will escape danger. As far as concerns your Lordship, in case you have incurred any regularity, the Pope bestows upon you his holy benediction."

Just as Pius V. exceeded the requirements of Canon law, so Gregory XIII. exceeded them. The man who is excommunicate in Canon law occupies a position analogous to the man outlawed in civil law. The excommunicate is indeed in a worse position. For his murder, in the eyes of Canon law, is simply a matter which calls for penance, "lest the discipline of the Church should suffer harm." The Gregory XIII. who so whole-heartedly desired the assassination of Elizabeth is the same Gregory XIII. who declared the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was more agreeable to him than fifty victories of Lepanto. Naturally it was hoped that in other lands the faithful would follow the example of the French. On September 8, 1572, Gregory XIII. went in procession to the French Church of St. Lewis, where thirty-three cardinals attended a Mass of thanksgiving. Three days later the Pope proclaimed a jubilee. In the Bull he said that forasmuch as God had armed the King of France to inflict vengeance on the heretics for the injuries done to religion, and to punish the leaders of the rebellion which had devastated his kingdom, Catholics should pray that he might have grace to pursue his auspicious enterprise to the end, and so complete what had begun so well. Is it a matter for grave

surprise that such a Church should stink in the nostrils of Englishmen of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ?

In Lord Acton's Correspondence it is clear that when the learned historian writes to Lady Blennerhassett he confides his conclusions that the Ultramontanes were " worse than the accomplices of the Old Man of the Mountain, for they picked off individual victims, but the Papacy contrived murder and massacre on the largest and also on the most cruel and inhuman scale. They were not only wholesale assassins, but they also made assassination a law of the Christian Church and a condition of salvation." [1] Lord Acton was a Roman Catholic, and he puts on record his measured conviction that " it is more essential that an enthusiast of the Papacy be made to contemplate its crimes, because its influence is nearer than Conscience ; and the spiritual danger of perverted morals is greater than the evil of perverted politics. It is an agency constantly active, pervading life, penetrating the soul by many channels. It is the fiend skulking behind the Crucifix. The corruption which comes from revolutionary or absolutist sympathies is far less subtle and expansive. It reaches the lower regions of the mind and does not poison that which is noblest." [2]

If the reader turns to such a book as the *Collected Essays and Reviews* written by the late Mr. T. G. Law he will certainly descend into that vast mine of intrigue set on foot by Popes like Pius V. and notably by Gregory XIII., which had tunnelled from end to end the island fortress of our land, and which, but for some flaws in the infernal machine, might at any moment have blown it into ruins. The distinction between priest and conspirator soon became so fine as to be hardly susceptible to the official eye. Despite the solemn protests of the Jesuits that they were forbidden by their superiors—as indeed they were—

[1] P. 55. [2] P. 56.

to meddle with politics, it is impossible to believe that all of them adhered to this salutary rule ; for their advent in England and, above all, in Scotland, was followed by a widespread conspiracy for the deposition of Elizabeth. Pius V. laid down in the notorious Bull of 1570 the teaching of the Church, and it was reserved for the Jesuits to put it into practice. Parsons on one occasion, when asked for proof of his assertion that English Roman Catholics were eager to take up arms, replied that he " knew all this from what many of them had declared when treating of their consciences." The Jesuits, in fact, took so readily to political intrigue that both Mary and Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador, complained in 1582 that, far from being content to act as intermediaries, they were " taking the road themselves." The character and the extent of their influence were revealed towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth when the secular priests appealed to the Government against them, and declared that they would not only discourage, but also resist, all attempts to propagate Roman Catholicism by the sword. The people of the Church of England were fervently loyal and their clergy were no less loyal. It is easy to understand the feeling, the intense feeling, excited against the Church of Rome at the end of the sixteenth century and during the whole of the seventeenth century when we realise that what the ordinary man knew best about it was the fact that the members of that Communion were engaged in incessant plots against the very life of his beloved queen. Of course there were loyal Roman Catholics then as now, as their conduct when the Armada sailed undoubtedly proves. At the same time there were so many disloyal that the loyalty of the rest received but scanty credence. What the average man felt from 1581 to 1596 was that there was a series of conspiracies concerted, more or less in Edinburgh, for the dethronement of Eliza-

beth, with the active aid first of France and then of Spain, and finally of Spain alone. These two nations were Roman Catholic nations, and their agents were the priests in England in general and the Jesuits in particular.

The dominant feeling of those days was that the gravest heresy of the Roman Catholic Church was the claim it put forth on behalf of the Papacy to hold a political supremacy over all princes and potentates. Its erroneous doctrines, its corrupt practices, were but as dust in the balance compared with its claim to use the deposing power. The generation that revolted against the rule of Gregory XIII. had been trained by hard facts to look upon him as the head of an alien jurisdiction threatening the real independence of the country. Sober political philosophers dreaded the power of Rome almost as much as did the people. Filmer opens his *Patriarcha* with an elaborate attack on Bellarmine's position. Hobbes devotes a whole book of *The Leviathan* to the Kingdom of Darkness, signifying thereby the Roman Catholic Communion. It was not to be borne by an Englishman that a Church should exist as a political body, claiming universal empire, and dissolving the bonds of national allegiance. He applied two parts of the famous sneer of Voltaire against it, for he affirmed that its holiness was at all events doubtful, and that it could by no means pretend to be an empire. Not for nothing had he imbibed the temper of Henry II. He saw the spirit of Thomas Becket in the followers of Ignatius Loyola, for no men defended the political power of the Papacy more ably than the Jesuits. No English Pascal declaims against their casuistry as does every line of the *Provincial Letters*. But they set Jesuits out as objects of public scorn, as traitors against the nation, seeking to hamper its free life.

National character, as the late F. W. Maitland has satirically pointed out, is a wonder-working spirit at

the beck and call of every embarrassed historian, a sort of *deus ex machina*, which is invoked to settle any problem which cannot be readily solved by ordinary methods of rational investigation. The gibe is thoroughly deserved. Yet, with the fear of it before our eyes, we do not hesitate to invoke it in order to explain that intense antagonism to Rome which characterised the workings of the brains of our forefathers. Our national character, moulding our institutions, shaping our ends, resented all attempts to undermine it. In this undermining there was, in the considered opinion of our forefathers, no *deus ex machina* equal to the Pope.

It is a law of mechanics that to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. The Church of England throughout the sixteenth century affords a conspicuous example of the working of this law. There is the labour of the great Reformation Parliament, and there is also the Act of the Six Articles. There is the legislation of an Edward VI., and there is also the legislation of a Mary I. If there is a Hooker, there is also a Hooper. The Puritan reaction at last came at the end of Elizabeth's reign, and its depth was proportional to the exaltation of the doctrine which had gone before. The mightier the wave, the greater is the stretch of sand ultimately left exposed. The example of Francis of Assisi raises his followers to a pinnacle beyond the reach of mankind ; but the work of the satirist and the record of the annalist agree in their evidence that the friars of the sixteenth century were as much below the level of good men as their predecessors were above it. Through the mouth of Pericles, Thucydides praises the Athenians for the exact qualities which, in the eyes of Demosthenes, they utterly lack. The energy of the Athenians of one century was as much above the normal level as that of their descendants of the next century was below it. There were many changes in the spirit

of Anglicanism, many experiments, before its great *via media* was reached. There are many swings of the pendulum backwards and forwards before the repose of the mean is reached.

There is a divine event towards which the Anglican Communion is moving, but it is still far off, still slow in coming. For the reformers of the sixteenth century the drums never sounded, the banners never fluttered, the cheers of victory never rent the air. A larger measure of success was vouchsafed to the men of the seventeenth century. Still, their work was incomplete. In literature the crown of success falls to many. Gibbon is not the only historian to conclude his life's work in such calm detachment that he may meditate upon the last sentence among the acacias in a starlit garden at Lausanne. In life, especially the life of religion, it is otherwise. The thoughts of Cranmer and Hooker must have been bitter when they saw their labours were not destined to completion. What were the last thoughts of Raphael that Good Friday, nearly four hundred years ago, as he gazed at his "Transfiguration"? It is the fate of the reformer during the sixteenth century that he sees his task unfinished. A Cranmer shatters an old building standing in the way. A Hooker adds foundation-stones. The next three centuries have succeeded in raising the stately edifice of Anglicanism.

NOTE

One of the underlying causes of the English Reformation was the deep-seated dislike manifested by the people to the Ecclesiastical Courts, which instituted minute and vexatious inquiry into breaches of moral discipline. Cf. Archdeacon Hale's little known *Precedents and Proceedings* (London, 1847). For the unpopularity of this jurisdiction Chaucer provides earlier evidence.

III

ROME AS UNREFORMED

BY

G. G. COULTON, M.A. Camb., Hon. Litt.D. Durham

FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
AUTHOR OF "CHRIST, ST. FRANCIS, AND TO-DAY,"
"THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE," ETC.

SYNOPSIS

Exclusiveness of the Roman Hierarchy and its peculiar conception of truth which can only end in estranging more thoughtful minds. Censorship and newspaper propaganda. Restrictions laid on even the greatest scholars. The fatal claim of Infallibility. Cardinal Newman and Acton on historical falsehoods. Cardinal Manning typical of the Ultramontane attitude towards history. This leads logically to intolerance. Even the modern Roman Church has never abandoned its mediaeval claim to inflict death. But, since she is now debarred from the use of this weapon in practice, her principles tempt her to tamper with truth. The Priest as Physician of Souls. Falsehoods taught in the seminaries. Essentially sectarian nature of modern Roman Catholicism. Its impenitent libels upon other Communions contrasted with the comparative readiness of others to abandon untenable falsehoods. "Ask him to commit it to writing." The Physician of Souls again. Why are his patients rather less healthy than others? The failure of Infallibility in practice as contrasted with what was expected of it in 1870. History condemns the exclusive pretensions of the Roman Hierarchy; so also do modern statistics. Hopeless failure of the censorship system. Realities are abandoned for the sake of superficial successes.

III

ROME AS UNREFORMED

In Switzerland, where Protestants and Roman Catholics are exceptionally equal in numbers and friendly to each other, the outward resemblances are striking between one village congregation and another. At Protestant Adelboden, as at Roman Catholic Argentières, the church is packed on Sunday, and the natural meeting-time for the peasants is after service. Protestants and Roman Catholics worship one God; but at bottom there is a deep division. One party may intermarry with the other only under the strictest limitations;[1] even after many concessions to the modern spirit, the Roman Catholic is commanded by his Church to treat the outsider with ancient Jewish exclusiveness; but for the ineradicable spirit of passive disobedience, these two parties would live in almost continual enmity. And the paradox is, that the party insisting on these exclusive terms is apparently

[1] These are the latest prescriptions of Canon law, fundamentally revised by order of Pius X. and Benedict XV. "The Church doth most severely prohibit, everywhere, the contract of matrimony between two baptized persons whereof the one is Catholic and the other of an heretic or schismatic sect; and, if there be any danger of the perversion of the Catholic spouse or the children, let the marriage itself be forbidden even by divine law. The Church gives no dispensation for this impediment of mixed marriages (1) unless just and weighty causes urge it; (2) unless the non-Catholic spouse give a guarantee for removing the peril of perversion from the Catholic spouse, and both husband and wife give such guarantees for baptizing and educating all the children in the Catholic faith alone; (3) unless there be a moral certitude of the fulfilment of this guarantee. Let such guarantees be regularly demanded in writing. The Catholic spouse is bound by the obligation of prudently caring for the conversion of his or her spouse." (*Codex Juris Canonici Benedicti Papae XV. auctoritate promulgatus.* Rome, Vatican Press, 1917: canons 1060-62.)

the less civilised of the two. The villages are poorer and dirtier ; its peasants are less educated than the Protestant peasant ; in the great towns it has lost ground steadily in the past, and is losing still ; Geneva, Bâle, Zurich, and Lausanne, all Protestant, are the chief homes of Swiss learning ; after them comes the Roman Catholic Fribourg. We have here something of the same phenomenon as in India, where it is far easier for an Eastern to enter a European house than for Europeans to see anything of the Eastern home. Exclusiveness in religion may indeed come from a greater sense of dignity, but it may come also from mere narrowness of mind and fear of open competition. The man who has subconscious misgivings about his own position is even more exclusive than another who has so fully traversed all his rival's ground, and so carefully weighed the arguments on either side, that he holds it henceforth a waste of time to reconsider them. The latter has at least begun by basing himself upon universal standards of truth ; the former conceives truth only as he can dare to conceive it ; he is warped by his secret fears. And this difference comes out even more emphatically when he belongs to a strictly disciplined party in which the leaders claim absolute power, while the rank and file are schooled to unwavering obedience.

The Roman Conception of Truth

In one way it is the peculiar strength of the *official* Church of Rome, as it is her fundamental weakness in the long run, that her conception of truth differs thus from what other men usually understand by that word. I underline the word *official*, because we all know that an average Roman Catholic differs very little from the average of other denominations. But the average Roman Catholic does not realise, nor do a great many others realise who are otherwise attracted

by the system, that they themselves, if the whole world could suddenly be brought to the Pope's feet, would be among the first to deplore the social changes which this would bring about. They would find themselves subject to a hierarchy whose claim of absolute obedience would at last be unrestrained (or, at best, only very partially restrained) by one of the most essential safeguards of society—free criticism. There has been no age or country in which the Roman hierarchy, possessing anything like uncontrolled power, has not made itself finally intolerable.

Nor is this merely accidental ; it is inherent in their fundamental pretensions. Other Churches are content to assert a certain superiority, moral or religious, over their rivals ; the Roman Church claims to possess The Truth in an absolute sense in which no other organisation, before or since, has ever made that claim. And this spiritual pride, which, if justified, would put her indisputably foremost in the eyes of the immense majority of well-meaning and thoughtful people, does, in practice, degrade the claimant in proportion as her claim is false to facts. This universe, when we scan it closely, is not found to show such hard-and-fast differences between man and man or society and society ; God has created a world not of crude contrasts but of subtle light and shade. But the hierarchy is not content with God's world ; it must make a world of its own. Wherever it has had a free hand, it has created a Frankenstein monster ; unchecked Romanism has failed, as even its apologists sometimes admit.[1] Many of the virtues of the modern Roman Catholic are due to competition with those other denominations which his hierarchy despises ; apart from such competition, the failure has always been obvious.

[1] H. Belloc, *Europe and the Faith*, 1920, pp. 298, 307. It needed the wars with the Protestants to "revivify France" ; Spain would have been better to-day if she had had Protestants to fight ; religious indifference "is always common to a society long and profoundly Catholic and ignorant of heresy."

Here again, however, I must emphasise the word *hierarchy*. Of the average Roman Catholic, even more than of the average of other religious denominations, it may be said that he lives a decent life with decent respect to the tenets of his Church, and is quite unfamiliar in detail with the most complicated system of theology that was ever invented. The penny catechism is enough for him ;[1] for the rest, he trusts the priest, and the priest is under strict orders from the bishop, who owes equally implicit obedience to the Roman court. With the single exception of the modern Bolshevik, nobody lives under so strict a system of literary censorship as the average Roman Catholic. It is no longer possible to keep him away from the daily newspaper and the ordinary magazines ; but, even here, he has less chance than most people of seeing the opposite side on strictly theological questions. Newspaper editors, naturally enough, take no direct interest in theological controversy, and pay most attention to the side from which they have most to fear. There is no body so able and so ready to boycott a newspaper as the Roman Catholic Church ; in America, this boycott is so systematic that it is notoriously almost impossible to print unpalatable theological truths. Moreover, presswork is specially congenial to the Irish character ; and Roman Catholic pressmen are disproportionately numerous. There is a good side to this ; theological controversy is certainly not the most profitable form of literature, either in the ethical or in any other sense ; and, however necessary it may be at times, the world might easily get too much of it. But the fact remains that, in purely theological questions, the ordinary newspapers give far more prominence to the Roman Catholic, as opposed to the anti-Roman Catholic, position than the actual numbers of believing and practising Roman Catholics would strictly warrant. Further, there is a social and intel-

[1] R. H. Benson, *The Conventionalists*, pp. 124-25, 187.

lectual fashion, partly by reaction from the exaggerations and tactlessness of Protestants in the past, in favour of Roman Catholicism. An agnostic will say, "If I believed at all, I would be a Roman Catholic," just as he might say, "If I were a militarist at all, I would do it in the thorough Prussian fashion."

But, apart from this general atmosphere, the Roman Catholic is at the mercy of far more systematic intellectual restrictions. Take the latest book of any pretensions upon the history of Monasticism, by Dom Cuthbert Butler. Dom Butler, at Cambridge, gained a considerable reputation for his study of early monasticism in the East; he has published perhaps the best edition of the Benedictine Rule yet printed; and he is abbot of the most distinguished Benedictine house in England. Yet, at the end of his *Benedictine Monasticism* is printed the solemn permission of two censors: "*Nihil obstat.* D. Michael Barrett. O.S.B. *censor deputatus—Imprimatur* ✣ Geo. Ambrosius. *Ep. Cliftonien.*" Nor is this a mere form; it means that any description of mediaeval monasticism which had displeased the hierarchy would have been pitilessly eliminated from the abbot's book. These particular censors may well be as ignorant of actual monastic history as the average Roman Catholic is; the Benedictine status of the first gives no real guarantee here; but they know very well what the hierarchy wants. By far the greatest of Roman Catholic monastic historians, Dom Mabillon, was suppressed whenever he ventured to confess anything beyond what was already notorious to cultivated readers. Much is boasted of the glory which his scholarship reflects on his Church; little is said of his narrow escape from the *Index of Prohibited Books*, or of the actual suppression of a preface in which he had done no more than draw attention to undeniable facts of monastic decay. Dom Butler has no wish to share Dom Mabillon's fate; and, in all that he says about monasticism for the last four

centuries before the Reformation, he confines himself to platitudes copied from Cardinal Newman—so slavishly copied, indeed, that he actually reproduces with implied approval an important statement which, on a previous page, he has admitted to be false.[1]

This it is, then, which essentially distinguishes the Roman from the non-Roman Catholic writer. These severe restrictions on the printed word are not kept up for mere form ; they are one of the most distinctive features of Roman policy. Misstatements and party errors are unfortunately frequent everywhere, though this initial temptation is far stronger on the Roman side. But it would be quite impossible to convict any non-Roman Catholic with a reputation to lose, or any non-Roman Catholic whose official position gives a real stamp of authority to his utterances, of that hardened persistence in error which is quite common on the Roman side. It is the fatal inheritance of Infallibility that it cannot afford to confess even the most patent and notorious blunders. Nobody ever adopted Luther's immoral moral, *pecca fortiter*, more whole-heartedly than it is adopted by the Roman hierarchy. From the moment when one local Church began to claim an inherent superiority and dominion over other Churches, she started upon an inclined plane which led her fatally, in the Middle Ages, to organised cruelty and bloodshed, and which, in these days of discredited brute force, leads her to historical falsehood. That invidious word must be used without qualification ; for three of the greatest modern Romanists have spoken more explicitly on this subject than any Protestant would have spoken without suspicion of extreme bigotry. After hearing their verdict, the reader may be better able to weigh the facts which I shall quote in their support.

Cardinal Newman, in almost the first words which

[1] See the present writer's review in the *Hibbert Journal* for January 1920, pp. 420 ff.

he printed as a Roman Catholic, complained : " It is melancholy to say it ; but the chief, perhaps the only English writer who has any claim to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, is the infidel Gibbon." [1]

That condemnation fell equally upon his old and his new Church ; but not so his later and still more pessimistic utterance. In 1864, after nineteen years' experience of the Roman Communion, he was approached as to the foundation of a Catholic Historical Review. He wrote in reply to Father Coleridge : " Nothing would be better than an Historical Review for Roman Catholics—but who would bear it ? Unless one doctored all one's facts, one should (sic) be thought a bad Catholic." [2]

A far greater historical scholar than Newman, Lord Acton, wrote to Gladstone in 1876 : " I think you are too hard on Ultramontanes, and too gentle with Ultramontanism. You say, for instance, that it promotes untruthfulness. I don't think that is fair. It not only promotes, it inculcates distinct mendacity and deceitfulness. In certain cases it is made a duty to lie. But those who teach this doctrine do not become habitual liars in other things." [3]

And what Newman and Acton allege by way of accusation, Cardinal Manning practically confessed in self-defence. It has often proved impossible to reconcile Roman claims with historical fact ; and, in those cases, Manning tells us plainly which must give way. He wrote to the *Daily Telegraph* (Oct. 8, 1875, col. 5) : " The appeal from the living voice of the Church to any tribunal whatsoever, human history included, is an act of private judgement and a treason, because that living voice is supreme ; and to appeal from that supreme voice is also a heresy, because that

[1] *Essay on Development*, 1845, Introd. p. 5.

[2] *The Month*, January 1903, p. 3.

[3] *Letters*, ed. Figgis and Lawrence, 1917, p. 43 ; cf. *Letters to Mary Gladstone*, Introd. p. lv, from which we see that this was a very deliberate expression of opinion, and that Lord Acton kept a copy of what he had written.

voice, by divine assistance, is infallible." How necessarily Manning's attitude is adopted by all who base themselves upon the dogma of Roman infallibility may be seen from the argument of the Jesuit Father Coupe, in a pamphlet published by the Catholic Truth Society.[1] "If one Pope could be proved to have taught error *ex cathedra*," says this authorised exponent of modern Roman Catholicism, "the Catholic Church collapses like a house of cards, and Christianity collapses with it." "If there be no such teacher [as an infallible Pope] to enlighten us, then Christianity is a delusion and a dream, and there is nothing for us but, like the pagans of old, to cry out in anguish and desolation of heart: 'God there is none! future life there is none! Let us drink and make merry, for to-morrow we die.'" There is a comic side to this which may only too easily overshadow its tragic side. The idea of any human being presuming to lay down certain narrow conditions under which alone he will do God the favour of believing in His existence, is sufficiently grotesque to begin with. Even more grotesque is the picture of many thousand Roman Catholic priests and Religious suddenly coming to agreement with what the majority of competent historians believe to-day—with what nearly all the most competent historians of their own Church believed until their mouths were sealed by the decree of 1870—and then hastening to make the best of this brief life with such sensual indulgences as they can scramble for. But these are far overshadowed by the tragedy that men should thus pin their whole faith, for this world and the next, upon the narrowest and most one-sided interpretation of certain historical data which, to put it most mildly, are as disputable now as they have been for the last thousand years. Father Coupe's attitude is frankly suicidal, limiting

[1] *The Alleged Failures of Infallibility*, pp. 2-3. It is now, I find, out of print; but I am not aware that any attempt has been made to disown its doctrines.

the permanent membership of his Church to the most ignorant and unthinking, and rendering even temporary orthodoxy possible only to those who have embraced this creed too hastily, or who have too little leisure and opportunity after their conversion, to realise that step in all its bearings. If men like St. Bernard had held this creed, the world would have burst forth even earlier from this oppressive sectarian atmosphere ; the great religious revolution would have come long before the sixteenth century ; the Fathers of the Council of Constance, who still hoped against hope in a constitutional Papacy, would have considered open rebellion against this suffocating Papacy as their first and sternest duty.

Roman Intolerance

That which made the dream of a united Christendom possible for so many centuries was the relative freedom and elasticity of the mediaeval Church as compared with the Romanism of 1870. What shattered that dream was the fact that even this comparative freedom and elasticity was insufficient for the needs of a more civilised age ; and that, so far from growing with men's growing needs and possibilities, it was shrinking from year to year. For this demand for an infallibility impossible in human society is not only suicidal, it is also murderous ; potentially murderous at any time ; and actually so in the past, or wherever it has had anything like free play. The one element of civilisation which did not grow, but shrank, during the whole later Middle Ages, is the element of neighbourly tolerance. Religious cruelty, when Luther came forward, had not only been growing for centuries past, but was still increasing, and it remained as a fatal heritage on both sides for long after the Reformation. For any political or social monomania, however harmless in essence, is too apt to become murderous in

its implications ; we have lately seen even pacifists advocating forcible pacifism. The mediaeval Church, with all its beneficence in many ways, was growing into a class-dictatorship comparable to that of the French Revolutionaries or of the modern Bolsheviks ; its cruelty in action was strictly proportionate to its abstract claim of Infallibility. I do not say, to its conviction of Infallibility ; a man absolutely convinced of infallibility could afford to be the most tolerant of human beings. The Middle Ages may be far more truly called an Age of Acquiescence than an Age of Faith ; in every class there was much passive or active infidelity, especially in the higher and the lower strata of society. But the orthodox asserted, and the unorthodox seldom ventured openly to deny, that a man's last moments decided for ever between an eternity of unspeakable bliss or of unthinkable agony.[1] The most responsible teachers permitted themselves the most inexpressibly ghastly descriptions of hell. Some of those who were most widely read even suggested appalling statistical forecasts—thousands would go to hell for one that could find his way to heaven [2]—and everything depended upon a man's faith at the last moment. Yet unfaith grows so easily, unless we are busy with the constant application of fire and sword !

No other society that claims a moment's respect from the modern mind has ever organised brute force so elaborately for the suppression of differences of opinion, or has had such logical justification for this wickedness. Given Aquinas's premisses, his argu-

[1] For purgatory, of course, was conceived as strictly temporal, and no amount of purgatory was comparable to those two infinities on one side or on the other.

[2] I am giving full details and references in a volume I hope soon to publish through the Cambridge University Press—*Five Centuries of Religion.* These forecasts survived the Reformation not only on the Calvinist side, but among the most orthodox Roman Catholics. Massillon, one of the four classic preachers of the French Church, calculated that there might be only one soul predestined to bliss among the large congregation which he addressed in his sermon *Sur le petit nombre des élus.*

ments for the pitiless extermination of heretics are unanswerable, his logic is an iron chain ; and that in itself is the plainest condemnation of the Church for which Aquinas speaks. The philosopher's inadmissible conclusions, shocking to the civilised mind of to-day, point clearly to an impossible foundation. Yet Aquinas's arguments bind even the modern Roman Catholic with necessities which he may easily ignore in practice, thanks to modern society and the modern spirit, but from which he cannot morally escape. Let us suppose that our friend X makes up his mind, to-morrow, to join the Roman Church. The hierarchy have every right to demand from him a reasoned and deliberate profession of loyalty to the body with which he wishes to throw in his lot ; he may want them for his masters, but they do not want him for a servant without guarantees of fidelity. The chosen test is the Creed of Pope Pius IV. ; to that the convert must necessarily subscribe without reservation.[1] The 11th clause of that Creed (or, according to some computations, the 17th) runs, " I receive unhesitatingly (*indubitanter*) all things, handed down, defined, and *decreed* by the sacred Canons and *ecumenical* Councils, and especially by the holy Council of Trent." (Italics mine.) The greatest of all previous ecumenical Councils held in the West had been Innocent III.'s Fourth Lateran Council (1215). In the 3rd Canon of that Council it is enacted that bishops should inquire at least once a year in every parish, with power, if need be, to compel the whole community on oath to name any heretics whom they know. An aider or abettor of a heretic is himself *ipso facto* excommunicate ; if discovered and publicly excommunicated, he incurs civil death, and those who communicate with such abettors shall themselves be excommunicated. For the heretics

[1] The Creed is contained in the Pope's Bull of 1564, *In Sacrosancta.* It is generally, if not always, printed in the appendix to the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.

themselves, they are to be "exterminated," and any prince neglecting to exterminate them is to be deposed by the Pope, who will release his subjects from their allegiance. Even if we could otherwise have doubted what "extermination" means in its final implications, the word is clearly glossed by St. Thomas Aquinas: "remove from the world by death."[1]

Our friend X, therefore, will to-morrow be bound to exterminate us as best he can, at any moment when it might please the hierarchy to command it, by an oath as binding as that which binds him to hold the Nicene Creed, to follow the Roman Catholic interpretation of all Biblical texts, the Roman doctrine of the Sacraments, and all the other things specified in the Creed of Pope Pius IV. It is no good his pleading that he has not even heard of this Lateran canon; he has solemnly sworn obedience to all these canons, whether he has read them or not. Nor can he plead that his friends in modern Britain are not heretics in that sense; for this plea, however regularly used by the clergy in private, and even sometimes printed in safer quarters, could not for a moment be maintained under cross-examination.[2] Father Rickaby, for instance, asserts it in his *Oxford Conferences* on the authority of Aquinas; but, instead of supporting it by St. Thomas's own words, he adduces no evidence but from his own abbreviated summary of the *Summa Theologiae*, in which he has garbled the Saint's plain meaning. Not only the words of the mediaeval Church but its actions also leave no room for the modern exception in favour of heretics-born.[3]

No recognition of an essential distinction between

[1] *Sum. Theol.* 2a 2ae quaest. xi. art. 3.

[2] I emphasised this on pp. 192 ff. of *Christ, St. Francis, and To-day*, with special reference to Father Rickaby's misstatements. No Roman Catholic reviewer ventured to contradict the facts there brought forward. Compare Rickaby, *Oxf. Conf. for 1897*, p. 7, with Aquinas 2a 2ae quaestt. x. and xi. For another misstatement of Father Rickaby, see Appendix I. Father Ryder, in his Reply to Littledale, shirks this question of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. altogether (7th ed. pp. 202-214).

[3] Cf. *Gesta Dei per Francos*, Migne, P. L., vol. 156, col. 715d.

heretics-born and other heretics troubled the fathers of the Council of Trent or representative Roman theologians down to very recent times. As late as 1901 a two-volume book on Church law was published at the official Papal press, with a commendatory letter from Leo XIII., by Father Marianus de Luca, Professor of Canon Law at the University of Rome. He not only claims the full right of killing heretics when expedient, but pitilessly explodes such pleas as Father Rickaby's : "To this penalty not only those are subject who, after the age of reason, have fallen away from the faith, but those also who, once baptized, and growing up in heresy, defend pertinaciously that which they have sucked in with their mother's milk." [1] In the following year a Roman Catholic claimed the same right in *The Spectator* (p. 291), adding, "The real reason why religious persecution is unpopular to-day is that nobody is strong enough to persecute." No member of the hierarchy, I believe, ventured to censure him or to plead that there had been any real change in the law of their Church since the Middle Ages.

That we should ever go back to mediaeval practice here is, of course, almost unthinkable ; and it is perfectly natural that thousands should join the Roman Church without the remotest realisation of their legal commitments, just as thousands had put their money equally blindly into unlimited ventures, until the advance of education and the more serious competition of Limited Liability Companies gradually drove the unlimited almost entirely out of the field. But what makes it possible for the modern convert to ignore the atrocious doctrine to which he thus pledges himself by oath ? Not any change in the official Roman Church, but a rising tide of civilisation which has

[1] *Inst. Juris Ecclesiastici Publici*, vol. i. pp. 258 ff. ; for fuller quotations from this and *The Spectator*, see *Christ, St. Francis, and To-day*, pp. 192-94, where I have dealt more fully with the whole question. I am not aware that any reviewer—though two, at least, wrote from the Catholic side—has questioned the accuracy of the facts there quoted.

swamped the grosser material claims of that Church. This proud exclusiveness of Roman Catholicism, which has always attracted so many minds, is not only fundamentally unevangelical but fundamentally anti-social. And, now that society forbids the hierarchy to slay for their faith's sake, they are often driven to lie for it. This is the word Lord Acton uses in its naked bluntness, and which Newman wraps up in that melancholy sentence : " Unless one doctored all one's facts, one would be thought a bad Catholic." The Church's necessity was bad enough in the past, when inconvenient arguments could be met by physical force and when the ground to be defended was far less difficult. But, now that all Roman Catholics are bound to defend a Papal Infallibility from which even saints sat loose in the past, the advantage which the hierarchy thus gains over thoughtless or ignorant minds is more than counterbalanced by the difficulties created among the more thoughtful. Even the strictest censorship will not prevent the faithful from hearing very serious objections ; therefore the public must be fed with statements which, however false to fact, are true to Roman dogma. A few concrete examples will explain why Acton and Newman speak of this policy in words which a Protestant could not have written without incurring the suspicion of bigotry.

The Priest as Physician of Souls

The strict discipline of the Church of Rome presupposes great official care to eliminate faith from error. To adopt the favourite simile of the Roman hierarchy, *The Priest is the Physician of Souls.* But what precautions do the children of this world, earthly legislators, take in this matter of medicine ? First, they leave each man free to choose his own physician ; even under the latest panel system, a man who has suffered from his doctor's blunders may exchange

him for any other whose fees he can pay. Secondly, the law protects the patient, not only against the doctor's malice (which is an even less probable contingency than the priest's), but also against crass ignorance or carelessness on his part. A doctor who mistook shingles for typhoid, or corrosive sublimate for quinine, would not only be repudiated by his own faculty, but would be liable to an action for heavy damages to his patient. Therefore, to give any reality to this simile of *physician of souls* we must postulate a society in which the patient is not only at liberty to choose the best he can afford, and not only safeguarded by the rules of a profession jealous for its own honour, but even more definitely protected by civil law against incompetence or carelessness on the part of the man to whom he commits himself. Yet, on these three vital points, there is perhaps no society among civilised nations which gives so little security as the Roman Catholic priesthood. Here the assumption of Infallibility at the centre makes it practically impossible to protect the patient against his doctor. The principle of forcible feeding coexists with an appalling indifference to the quality of the food administered. In no other society is a man so strictly compelled to swallow what is given to him, and so often offered tainted or poisonous stuff.

The clergy of other Communions are not absolutely tied down to certain text-books. Even in the narrowest Anglican or Nonconformist theological college there is nothing to prevent a student from wandering outside the official syllabus ; moreover, that syllabus may itself contain some Roman Catholic book. If the student picks up erroneous ideas from one book, he has at least a reasonable chance of correcting them by comparison with some other. And, at the very most, our opponents may safely be challenged to produce, from the text-books in our colleges, anything even remotely approaching to the falsehoods which are

sometimes not only offered to, but forced upon, the Roman Catholic seminarist, who may easily pass on to the priesthood, and reach his allotted threescore years and ten, without any suspicion of the imposition thus practised upon him.

Alzog's *Church History* was, for a good many years, the best obtainable within a reasonable compass by a Roman Catholic ; Alzog was professor at Freiburg i/B., which has a high reputation for scholarship in that Communion. It was translated by two American seminary-professors in 1874, and published with the warmest approval by the Archbishops of Cincinnati and Baltimore as "specially fitted to be a text-book on the subject in Colleges and Seminaries." I quote from the second edition, which was published at Dublin in 1879, "carefully revised." The translators assure us of their exceptional fidelity. They have added "notes, corrections, observations, and amplifications. It is not, however, to be inferred that any passages of the original have been either altered or omitted ; on the contrary, everything has been conscientiously given, but very often with additions and amplifications."[1] Again, "This translation, while scrupulously faithful, is, as has been said, not a slavish rendering of the German, but embodies the results acquired from the reading of various reliable authors, and may, it is hoped, be a partial improvement on the original."[2] Why need the translators have protested so much ? Is it so usual to *alter or omit*, to refrain from *giving conscientiously*, to abandon *scrupulous faith* in a translation ? A work so warmly blessed by two Archbishops, each of whom separately implies that he has read it with sufficient care, might be presumed to be conscientiously protected from any alterations or omissions which, however they might please the reader, would be treacherous to the author. Yet this is not really so ; in actual

[1] Vol. i. p. vii. [2] *Ibid.* p. ix.

fact the learned Alzog was found too learned and too frank for American seminaries ; the young priest could not be permitted to see all that Alzog had found in the actual documents of the past. We need not pay much attention to the minor liberties taken by the translators in softening the historian's blame of their own Church or exaggerating his blame of Protestants ; here, once or twice, they do something to redress the balance ; their emphasis is not invariably on their own side. But, when it comes to the main question of Papal Infallibility, the question whether the decision of a Pope or of a General Council is supreme, then they do not hesitate to falsify Alzog's text. Their treatment of the Council of Constance is bad enough : when they come to the Vatican Council of 1870, with its final definition of Infallibility, the differences are so violent that Alzog and his translators might be printed as pamphleteers on opposite sides.

It is evident how much the official character of these misstatements adds to their mischievous effect. The matter here dealt with is a matter of history ; yet these physicians of the soul (quite apart from the falsehood of their gratuitous profession of faithfulness as translators) have concocted an historical medley which would be contradicted by nine out of every ten modern students of history ; and from this concoction, or others like it, more than two thousand millions of people are not only suffered to drink, but are forbidden to drink elsewhere. If the American professors had dared to publish those facts which even Alzog dares only to hint at, and especially the documents to which he distantly refers, then this publication would at once have been snatched from the lips of the faithful as a cup tainted with the bacillus of Protestantism or Infidelity ; to the official Church historical truth and Catholic falsehood are almost convertible terms.

My next instance, out of dozens which might be adduced, shall be chosen to show how essentially unchristian this policy is, quite apart from its incompatibility with even heathen morality. It is a frequent Roman Catholic boast that, whereas sectaries are bitter and negative, Rome goes quietly on her positive path to heaven. Let us admit from the first that there is some real truth in this ; that, to many true Roman Catholics, the one overmastering feeling is that of solidarity ; that they believe themselves to be pressing steadily forward in the footsteps of all the saints of past centuries ; and that, in many cases, they are in fact as true to this belief as any human being is to so high an ideal. The solid unostentatious virtues often found amid the Roman Catholic multitude go far to redeem the errors of the hierarchy. If there were nothing in Romanism but the weaknesses which this chapter seeks to expose, it would long ago have perished. But, on the other hand, if the things here exposed had been swept away, and if that Church had gone on steadily, for a few generations only, with a preponderance of inward truth and charity over mere official falsehood, it would long since have conquered the world. The non-Catholic is certainly tempted to particularism, to religious and intellectual selfishness ; often, when he is quite right in detail, he cannot see the wood for the trees ; it is not in human nature that this besetting temptation should be always avoided even by those who fully recognise it. If Roman Catholicism, while fearlessly facing the truth, could still remain united ; and if non-Roman Catholics, while insisting on truth of detail, failed finally to find any closer union among themselves than the mere agreement to repudiate Roman Catholicism, then in the long run Roman Catholicism would conquer, and deserve to conquer. But the experiment has still to be made more seriously on both sides ; and, meanwhile, it is essential to recognise that the non-Roman Catholic

is not the only man who is tempted to negation. In that which Roman Catholicism claims as most positive, there is implied one of the cruellest negations in the world. There exists no other civilised society which proclaims, with an emphasis even approaching to that of Roman Catholicism, "We have the whole truth, the perfect truth, and therefore there is no real comparison between us and the rest of the world." Between other religious denominations there can be give and take, since none pretends to be infallible; all claim to be struggling only imperfectly after God's truth. But between Romanist and non-Romanist no give and take is possible; that is Rome's special boast, and she must take the logical consequences of it. The orthodox Roman Catholic cannot abate one jot of the claim which Newman, twenty-two years after his conversion, made to his old friend Pusey: "The Roman Communion is either the Church or it is not; if it is not, don't seek to join it,—if it is, don't bargain with it—beggars must not be choosers."[1] Therefore orthodox Romanist writers naturally start from the assumption which Mr. Belloc naïvely confesses: "The Catholic brings to [the History of Christendom] self-knowledge. He is not relatively right in his blame, he is absolutely right."[2] This Church, in fact, has staked out a claim to the whole universe; only tardily, and under pressure of public opinion, have Roman Catholics conceded that a few other good and pious people may really be in the Church without seeming to be in it.[3] We others cannot claim our part in any but the smallest corner of God's world of truth without entering into definite

[1] Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, vol. vi. (1897), p. 149.

[2] *Europe and the Faith* (1920), p. 5. Compare the recent utterance of the Very Rev. Hugh Pope, Doctor of Sacred Scripture, "The real truth is—though it always sounds an invidious thing to say it—scholars outside the Catholic Church cannot rightly handle history" (*Dublin Review*, January 1921, p. 70).

[3] This belief was much more possible in the earlier days of the Church, before the Papal claim of supremacy: see *Christ, St. Francis, and To-day*, pp. 105, 190. A few mediaeval thinkers strove in this charitable direction; but these were mostly unofficial writers, who had more chance of risking liberal opinions.

controversy with this Church which has serenely claimed the whole for herself. The faith of the Roman Catholic is, in itself, a negation of faith to the enormous majority of God-created souls. If we are not ready to accept Newman's counsel, *beggars cannot be choosers*, then we can get to God only by denying claims which the Romanist himself will generally represent as an essential of his faith, though we may well hope that he does not quite realise the cruel and necessary implications of his own words.

But, apart from this sectarian and aggressive factor inherent in all orthodox Roman Catholicism, we frequently find their authors writing in the most frankly aggressive spirit.

The Jesuit Father Rickaby held a prominent teaching post among his co-religionists at Oxford, and was a contributor to those Catholic Truth Society pamphlets which are distributed with the Pope's special blessing. In one of these, entitled "Persecution," he wrote (p. 9), "The common Protestant notion is . . . that, whatever belief or opinion a man holds, *he is not morally accountable to God or to man for believing and thinking so*. Of course this is not always asserted in its fulness, but often with hazy and ill-defined limitations." I exposed publicly the obvious falsehood contained in the words I have here italicised, pointing out how, apart from the inherent improbability of this accusation, it was in fact contradicted implicitly by two, and explicitly by one, of the XXXIX. Articles, and challenging him to produce, from the vast body of Protestant religious writings, a single proof of his words. He replied with six pleas, of which the first explicitly destroyed his own case, while the others were childishly irrelevant. I pointed out in reply that he had committed himself to an accusation false and calumnious in effect, though doubtless not in intention, and pressed for evidence or retractation. He answered that "wrangling in the newspapers was his abhor-

rence" ; and this false accusation is still a commonplace with his co-religionists, as it has been for generations past.[1] When a stray Protestant writes nowadays under the old delusion that Indulgences are Papal licences to sin, he is at once corrected, and others take warning : yet the Roman Church does all she can to perpetuate an accusation even more calumnious and far more demonstrably absurd.

Lastly, one of the most respected of modern Benedictines, in answer to Bishop Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, has taken a line of defence very natural in impulse, however untenable in fact. The Bishop had alluded[2] to "the certainty that Ultramontane writers will always be found manipulating facts and making out a case." To this Dom Chapman replied,[3] "Protestant History, from the Magdeburg centuriators and Foxe to Froude, has been a series of lies, whether intentional, careless, or prejudiced. There is nothing like this on the Catholic side since the Middle Ages." Challenged to substantiate this accusation, or any part of it, he now pleads that the words were written "some years ago" "in a somewhat rhetorical appeal to Bishop Gore," and declines to discuss their truth or falsehood. When one of the best of this class shows so little sense of responsibility for a sweeping accusation of falsehood against all historians who oppose his own particular party, we may well appeal to him in those words of Job which one of the greatest of modern French Catholics addressed to his fellow-priests and dignitaries.[4] For, in the long run, this policy violates common sense no less than religion ; to the innocence of the serpent it joins the wisdom of a

[1] Mr. Belloc, for instance, writes in his *Europe and the Faith* (p. 68), "To-day, outside the Catholic Church, there is no distinction between opinion and faith, nor any idea that man is other than sufficient to himself." Thus, by dint of steady log-rolling from orthodox to orthodox, who take care not to correct each other or to acknowledge correction from without, Roman Catholics are encouraged to live under the comforting idea that self-sufficiency is specially characteristic of the Publican outside their own Communion.

[2] Ed. 1905, p. 112. [3] *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, p. 97.

[4] See Gratry's words in Appendix II.

dove. For it must be remembered that the question is far less one of original error than of obstinate adherence to errors which have been clearly exposed, and are thenceforward indefensible and must finally be acknowledged some day, if not at this moment. Every ethical system, Catholic or not, recognises that the worst fault is the unrepentant fault. The Anglican writers whom Dom Chapman pillories have often found the most unsparing criticism within their own Communion. No man has taken such pains to point out Foxe's errors as S. R. Maitland, a loyal Anglican. No Anglican bishop would dream of reprinting the *Book of Martyrs* for broadcast distribution at the present day, yet Cobbett's *Protestant Reformation*, full of far less justifiable misstatements, is republished with notes and a commendatory preface from the highest Roman Catholic quarters, and sold by the thousand at the present moment. Again, Froude's bitterest critic, by far, was the loyal Anglican, Freeman;[1] and when Froude was chosen for an Oxford professorship as the crown of a long historical career, criticism was perhaps quite as strong in the non-Roman Catholic as in the Roman Catholic camp. Yet none of Froude's inaccuracies, whether we consider them as ignorances or as sins against candour, were comparable to those which are published by Roman Catholics higher in official position than he, and which are steadily supported, whether tacitly or explicitly, by the hierarchy. The recent Catholic Bible Congress at Cambridge was prefaced by the Bishop of Northampton, who enjoys a high reputation for learning and honesty within his own Communion. The Bishop protested that "when the truth of facts has been ascertained, no Cause, however sacred, can

[1] The generally expressed contempt for Froude's accuracy, though it is only too well founded up to a certain point, is also very much a matter of fashion; we hear a great deal of it because it was current gossip during the undergraduateship of men who now fill professorial chairs, and who have never troubled, in most cases, to examine the vouchers of Froude's critics. There is much to be said for Mr. Herbert Paul's defence (*Life of J. A. Froude*, 1905, chap. v.; esp. p. 193).

be served by ignoring or questioning them." I replied by printing plain historical facts which had been falsified, to an extent which no man has ever dared to deny or defend, by the principal speakers at that Conference ; after which I asked the Bishop publicly whether he could justify those falsehoods ; or, if not, whether he was prepared to do his best to prevent their dissemination. He took refuge in silence ; not even a bishop could venture to expose a cardinal's pro-Roman Catholic falsehoods ; for bishops themselves are enmeshed in the paralysing system of censorship.[1] Therefore, even though the initial falsehoods of Roman Catholic authors had been no worse than those of other writers of equal vogue—and Dom Chapman's very excuses seem to betray him here—yet the respective attitudes of Romanism and non-Romanism towards exploded falsehoods contrast so strikingly as to create an essential difference. The ordinary outsider has some real chance of learning the truth on these fiercely debated questions of history or modern fact ; the ordinary Roman Catholic has no chance. He is told to read Dom Chapman's reply ; books far more inaccurate than this are supplied to him for a few pence ; but he may not read Bishop Gore's book without mortal sin. Dom Chapman would be more than human if, under those temptations, he did not sometimes fall into hollow rhetoric which the first pin-prick will explode. And, having once fallen into an indefensible error, he would probably not even be permitted by his superiors to retract it as publicly as he had asserted it. In the last sixteen years I have frequently offered prominent Roman Catholics the opportunity of criticising me, under cross-examination, at my own expense ; they have consistently refused. In default of real public discussion, which such refusals render impossible, we can only fall back upon Mr. Brinckman's golden rule : when a Roman Catholic priest

[1] See my *Roman Catholic Church and the Bible*, 2nd ed. pp. 12, 13.

makes any important assertion which he emphasises in conversation, ask him to commit it to writing. It can then be publicly dealt with.

Papal Infallibility

This appalling absence of individual or corporate responsibility for published falsehoods explains why some of the greatest among modern Roman Catholics have confessed that the *official* pleas for their Church are too often founded on palpable falsehoods.[1] Indeed, nothing but a miracle could have avoided this when once the Church had committed herself to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. Let us recur to that favourite Roman Catholic metaphor of the physician; what would happen if the faculty of worldly medicine were ever systematised as this spiritual faculty now is? Let us imagine the Homoeopathists (whose tenets make the supposition more possible) rallying more and more definitely to the person of their pontiff Hahnemann, and progressively denying medical salvation to outsiders; while Allopathists, insisting on free discussion and inquiry, and willing even to borrow if necessary from Homoeopathy, must accept also the consequences of such free discussion; they would present a far less united front, and would decide on the most difficult cases with far less confidence. If these two policies gradually diverged until the Homoeopathists frankly claimed infallibility for all *ex cathedra* decisions of their founder and his legitimate successors, who can doubt that they would soon be entangled in a hopeless morass, that the instinct to hide or deny their blunders would increase in proportion to the frequency of those blunders, that the Homoeopathic body would find it almost impossible to disown a high official, and that they would most bitterly resent any attempt of the State to punish the carelessness

[1] See Appendix II.

or the crass ignorance of a practitioner who might have given his patient a poison disguised as a remedy? What but a miracle could save the mere physician of bodies from all these abuses?

But, pleads the Roman Church, this is just the one point on which our own favourite analogy breaks down; here miracle does in fact step in to save us, from the first we had Christ's promise that Peter and his successors should never fail; the Roman Church is the one God-given body of soul-physicians; these men (so far as their office and their graces are concerned) differ, not in degree, but in kind from all other physicians; here no comparison is possible.

Let us test this by history and by common sense. For many centuries (as all parties concede) this organisation reigned supreme in Europe. Four centuries ago, however, half Europe repudiated it, and thenceforward Western civilisation has been split into two camps; one camp has accepted these divinely inspired soul-physicians, and the other has cast them off. Christ warned us to judge truth and error by their visible consequences in conduct: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Who will dare to say that the countries which know no Protestantism—Spain, Italy, the Spanish States of South America—show by their fruits the healing virtues of a divine soul-diet, in contrast to the debasing consequences of four centuries of poison on the Protestant side? If we must make the comparison, how many even among Roman Catholics would dare to deny that the balance inclines rather the other way? Among Newman's ablest essays are those in which he vainly strives to explain away "The Social State of Roman Catholic Countries," and "The Religious State of Catholic Countries" at the present day.[1]

[1] First printed in 1850, among the lectures on *Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, published as two Cath. Truth Soc. pamphlets in recent years. In the original edition *Political* stands in the place of *Social* State.

Again, even in the countries where Protestantism scarcely exists, what hold has Roman Catholicism on the cultivated classes of to-day? Nowhere is aggressive anti-clericalism so bitter or so widespread as it is where men have known most of the priest.

Nor do these soul-physicians venture to grapple at all with the worst diseases at their most critical moments. To begin with, the Pope is not infallible except when he speaks *ex cathedra*; yet, after all these disputes as to the real meaning of that term, no responsible Roman Catholic will dare to specify, with any pretence of completeness, which past Papal utterances have been *ex cathedra* and which have not. Again, the Pope often declines to speak at all when he is most needed. All Western civilisation was torn with conflict as to the rights and wrongs of the last war; the Pope never dared to decide. Roman Catholic scholars contend with each other, at the present moment, as to the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, and as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, questions for which men would willingly have burned each other two centuries ago: yet the one man who cannot here make up his mind is the Pope, who has had eighteen centuries to decide. In all the disputes as to the Canon of Holy Scripture no Pope ever ventured to speak *ex cathedra*, and few even expressed a definite private opinion, until at last the Council of Trent decided in the teeth of the great majority of the Fathers. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception first aroused, and then fostered for centuries, one of the bitterest intestine quarrels that has ever raged in any Church, while Popes stood aloof or only interfered to forbid definition on either side. The whole University of Paris was rent by these quarrels: in 1403 a Royal confessor and a Dominican bishop had to do public penance for having taken the unpopular side; in 1497 the University refused its theological degree to any candidate who had not

first sworn to defend the Immaculate Conception; yet not until 1854 did any Pope venture to commit himself to this decision.[1] For seven centuries at least, before that decision came, the faithful had fought the question bitterly among themselves: men even invented the odious story that St. Bernard was condemned in heaven to wear a dark stain of ignominy upon his white robe, because he had fought against what, in his day, was an unauthorised innovation.[2] They are still contending about Biblical questions on which there is practical unanimity outside their Church. On the subject of the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, a Pope did at last say, in our generation, what to a plain man might seem conclusive; the faithful, it was proclaimed, might not "safely deny, or even treat as a matter of doubt, the authenticity of the text." Yet this decision is so far from having brought peace into the orthodox fold that Biblical scholars have amused themselves by driving their coach and horses through it, and actually boast their success in doing what the Pope decreed might not safely be done.[3] In short, it is just where Infallibility is most needed that it breaks down most hopelessly. Yet what really carried the vote for Infallibility in 1870 was a widespread delusion that the Pope thenceforward would be able to bring constant certitude to troubled souls on all important questions of faith or morals: "We must have a Pope who from day to day can himself infallibly teach, condemn, and define."[4]

Let us now test this doctrine of an infallible soul-physician on a wider scale.

Only a very superficial reading of mediaeval history can represent the so-called Ages of Faith as a time

[1] H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 1895, vol. i. pp. 527 ff.

[2] Cardinal Turrecremata, *De Conceptione B.V.M.* (Oxford, 1869), p. 291 (pars VI. C. 11). The fable had wide currency in popular circles: it occurs in more than one book of anecdotes for pulpit use.

[3] See my *Roman Catholic Church and the Bible*, 2nd ed. pp. 47 ff.

[4] Quoted from the *Unità Catholica* of May 24, 1870, by Alzog, *Handbuch d. K.G.*, Mainz, 1872, vol. ii. p. 532 note.

of spiritual peace. As I have already said, they were only Ages of Acquiescence; men suffered their pastors because they could see no way to get a better exchange. St. Bernard, in a well-known passage, says that we can no longer complain with Isaiah that the priests are as bad as the people; they are now even worse.[1] A little more than a century later, we get even bitterer complaints from Cardinal Hugues de St.-Cher, one of the main originators of the Feast of Corpus Christi, and president of the Commission which compiled the first concordance to the Vulgate. The clergy in general (he complains) are a derision to the people; they are not believed because their actions belie their words; they care nothing for the purity of the temple, but have bargained with the devil that he shall take the souls while they take the money; prelates are sometimes more rapacious and crueller than worldly princes; the iniquity of Sodom is theirs, "fulness of bread and abundance and idleness"; they do their will without correction; the clergy no longer hold their own in study against heretics; even the few who can preach are often unedifying in their works.[2] Such indictments become more frequent and more pessimistic as the Middle Ages wear on; whole volumes could be filled with them. Early in the fifteenth century, Jean Gerson judged the state of the Church to be almost irremediable; remedies seemed only to make her worse.[3] At the end of that century, the great mission-preacher Johann Geiler pointed out that even the very partial reforms he had lived to see were already dead, "How will it be, then, with reforming all Christendom?" And a chronicler, writing after his death, tells us that

[1] *Serm. de Sanctis*, I. § 3. No doubt, if pressed, the Saint would have added "considering their opportunities"; there has probably been no age or country in which the priests have been absolutely worse than the people.

[2] Hugonis de S.-C. *Opera omnia in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* (ed. Venice, 1600; ed. Cologne, 1621: the pagination is identical in both eds.), vol. v. pp. 80-84.

[3] *De Vita Clericorum*, in the Paris edition of his works, vol. ii. col. 556a.

he had preached in 1492 before the bishop and Chapter of Strassburg and a number of princes and nobles ; that he had foretold the coming of revolutionary reformers after his death, and had added, " The thing must burst "—*es muss brechen*.[1]

Then came the long-pent revolution, bringing many of the evils of revolution in its train. What country, of all that threw off the Roman obedience then, has ever shown any serious intention of returning? Boasts of conversion may cheer the Roman Church for a moment here and there, but in the long perspective of history her tide has steadily ebbed ; there is probably no district in which this Church increases in proportion to the increase of population ; in its main regions, France, Italy, and Spain, it has lost immensely during the last century.[2]

To this the Ultramontane can only answer that other creeds have lost too, thus falling back upon comparison where he had told us no comparison was possible. The statistics of religious population, like the statistics of comparative crime between one denomination and another, are such as no ingenuity can reconcile with the theory that one denomination has

[1] L. Dacheux, *J. Geiler* (1876), pp. 496-501. While Abbé Geiler warns us against accepting the chronicler's evidence too implicitly, the undoubted utterances of Geiler amount to an indictment quite as grave, and the chronicler only adds dramatic point by those three final words.

[2] See A. Brinckman, *The Controversial Statistics of Romanism* (S.P.C.K., 1895, 2nd ed.). At any given moment a Roman Catholic will assert that his denomination is increasing in numbers ; but when he commits himself to statistics, these contradict his assertion. Keenan's *Controversial Catechism*, published in 1846, reckoned the Roman Catholics in the whole world at 256 millions ; yet the 1896 edition only ventured to claim 220 millions at most ; and Cardinal Vaughan himself claimed only 240 millions. The great Roman Catholic petition of 1810 claimed that their Church " formed more than one-fourth of the whole mass of the United Empire " ; who would venture to put it anywhere near that figure to-day ? Many other figures, equally enlightening, may be found in Mr. Brinckman's little pamphlet ; *e.g.* p. 14 : " *The Tablet*, May 21, 1887, admits that Rome (by defections in England) loses more than she gains. Roman Catholics ought to be 2,360,000 ; they are 1,362,000 " ; for, of course, the general population had risen enormously since 1846. And only a small proportion even of these are fully practising Catholics ; in two exceptional districts, out of 11,000 persons there were less than 6000 who attended Mass and performed their Easter duty (p. 20). During 20 years, the Church of England alone contributed over £478,000 to the Hospital Sunday Fund ; the Roman Catholics under £11,000 (p. 18).

the practical monopoly of certitude in revelation; if it had, it would show a proportionate monopoly of Christian virtues. The plain facts before our eyes make it impossible for the Roman Catholic to claim more than a certain primacy *inter pares*; nor do these facts, by Christ's test, bear out even this far humbler claim. Wherever morality can be tested by statistics, a Roman Catholic country never stands at the head of any important movement. The statistics of illegitimacy, for instance, give a steady, though not very marked, superiority to the non-Roman Catholic; and this over so wide an area that all merely accidental differences must cancel each other. The one thing which emerges with overwhelming force is, that the worst record comes from exclusively Roman Catholic districts in which there is no Protestant competition to modify the mentality of the orthodox. Much is often made of Ireland's 28 illegitimate births per 1000, as compared with 46 in England and Wales and 75 in Scotland; but Bavaria in the same period had 138 and Portugal 150. The figures between 1910 and 1914 work out roughly at 359,200 illegitimates yearly to 4,221,000 births in Roman Catholic States, and 245,950 to 3,288,000 in Protestant. The proportions per 1000 are thus 85·1 and 74·8; *i.e.* for every 100 Roman Catholic illegitimates there are only 87·2 Protestant, in proportion to the total births on either side.[1]

The inference would seem to be inevitable. *A priori*, a Church is self-condemned in which the faithful are normally kept under a censorship even more rigorous than that which was imposed during the crisis of the Great War.[2] Nothing could justify such a policy but success; yet its failure is lamentable and obvious. It tempts apologists into saying the thing

[1] See Appendix III. for the extraordinarily garbled statistics on this subject current in high Roman Catholic circles.

[2] See pp. 50 ff. of *The Roman Catholic Church and the Bible.*

that is not ; it renders them almost physically incapable of admitting or retracting the errors into which they have been betrayed. We have seen how Lord Acton, intensely attached to the Church of his birth, confesses bitterly that " in certain cases it is made a duty to lie." And, though he denies the immediate effect of this upon private morality, it is impossible that it should not tell in the long run. The many virtues of the Roman Catholic priesthood and laity, their religious solidarity, cannot altogether counterbalance the intolerance and indifference to truth which follow from their unhistorical claim to a monopoly of truth. Judged by their fruits, they do not even rise a little above rival denominations ; there are virtues shown by modern Anglicanism and Nonconformity and Agnosticism which rule out those exclusive St. Petrine claims as emphatically as history does. Those who hanker after Roman Catholicism are not only in danger of committing themselves doctrinally to things from which, in their naked deformity, they would shudder, and which most of them could never so stifle their conscience as to put into practice. They are also blinding themselves to the patent facts of the world around them, which falsify precisely those Roman pretensions which, by their unique and uncompromising character, are at first sight most attractive.

APPENDICES

THE very serious accusations in my text need equally serious documentary evidence to support them ; hence these appendices. And here, as always before during the last sixteen years, I offer a further guarantee of good faith. Any one of the authors criticised, or any representative whom he will explicitly commission, is welcome to reply within reasonable limits to be arranged beforehand ; I will undertake to spend no more space on my rejoinder than he takes for his reply, and to print and publish the whole at my own expense. If, therefore,

I have fallen into serious errors of fact, I shall have to pay heavily for my own exposure. My experience is that, whatever criticisms Roman Catholic writers may offer in conversation, they seldom dare to commit these to print. A former curate of All Saints', Margaret Street, Mr. Arthur Brinckman, had a golden rule, "It is generally a case of one man's affirmation and another's denial. Years ago I began to advise every one I could who was at all likely to be attacked by Roman controversialists, to ask them just to put down their assertions in writing. The effect was excellent."

APPENDIX I

Father Rickaby, S.J.

I printed all my letters (Father Rickaby forbade my printing his) in the appendix to a pamphlet on *Catholic Truth and Historical Truth*, published in 1906, and now out of print. I am not aware that anybody has ventured to question these documents. My second letter, in reply to his first, gives, in fact, a summary of the whole correspondence. It ran: "Thank you for your communication; but I am sure you will see on reflection that it does not answer my letter. You accused the mass of Protestants of holding a tenet in itself most improbable (since the belief in an Almighty God naturally implies belief in our responsibility to Him for every thought as well as for every act); you neglect to give evidence for this in your pamphlet or your lectures, and that which you offer me now is, if you will pardon me the word, no evidence at all.

"I cannot help feeling, therefore, that you are still in my debt for some real proof of your assertion, as to a reader who has looked in vain for the references which you might well have published on the very page of your lectures on which you brought your strange accusation. If 'the common Protestant notion' is as you say, there must be literally hundreds of *direct* quotations to be found in the vast body of Protestant theological literature. I can only repeat for the present that it is a notion which I have never heard during my forty years of Protestantism, and one for which, as yet, you have advanced no real proof. You will, no doubt, allow me to treat this correspondence as public, since it turns on an accusation to which you yourself have given every publicity in your power."

As stated in my text, this distinguished Jesuit declined either

to justify his accusation further or to make the amends which even non-Christian morality demands for a false accusation.

APPENDIX II

Hierarchy and Truth

Acton and Newman, whose condemnation has already been quoted, were greater men than any living British Roman Catholics of to-day. If they spoke more plainly about these politicians' tricks in religion than even the average candid Protestant ventures to believe, that was because they saw the system from inside, and knew from bitter experience. To their testimony we may here add that of two other Catholics of almost equal distinction—Döllinger and Gratry.

(*a*) Father Gratry was a member of the Academy and Professor at the Sorbonne ; he was known for one of the most pious and learned Catholics in France. He wrote to Monseigneur Dechamps, *à propos* of the methods by which the doctrine of Infallibility was forced upon the Church, " *These disingenuous apologetics are one of the causes of our religious decay for centuries past.* As soon as men mark in the apostle the least trace of ruse or diplomacy, they turn aside and flee ; the best flee farthest. Souls hear not the voice of liars : ' the sheep hear not the voice of strangers.' *What are we, then, we Catholic priests, ministers of Jesus Christ and His gospel, and servants of His Church? Are we the preachers of a lie or the apostles of truth?* Is not every truth, every true thing, every real and historic fact on our side, as every lie is against us ? Is not the true course, then, in these ages of publicity when everything is seen and brought forward, when what was formerly whispered in the ear is now preached from the housetops—*is not the time come, I say, to reject with disgust those frauds and interpolations and mutilations which liars and forgers,* our most cruel enemies, have introduced among us ? . . . It was long before I myself dared to believe in these apologetics of ignorance, of blindness, of half-sincerity, or even of insincerity—de demi-bonne foi, ou même de mauvaise foi—which desire the end in view, which believe in the goodness and truth of that object, but which, for this end, take refuge in ruse, mystery, force, lies, and the fraudulent manufacture of false documents. I ask you once again, Does God need those frauds ? " [1] The

[1] A few pages earlier he had quoted from Job xiii. 7, " Hath God any need of your lie, that you should speak deceitfully for Him ? " The passage occurs at pp. 61 ff. of his *Premîère Lettre à Mgr. Dechamps*, Paris, 1870.

words italicised in this translation are those which Lord Acton pencilled with special approval in his copy (Camb. Univ. Lib., Acton, d. 7. 290). Gratry, in his last days, did indeed submit to the Church ; but he never revoked these accusations.

(*b*) There are two passages from Döllinger's letter to Professor Michelis (May 1, 1879) which Acton has marked with his approving pencil on pp. 109-10 of the Cambridge University Library copy of *Briefe und Erklärungen v. I. v. D.*, 1890 (Acton, d. 7. 206), "That [Leo XIII.] should bestow the Cardinalate on a man like Newman, who stands so high in intellect and knowledge above the common herd of Roman prelates, can only be explained by the fact that the man's real views are not known in Rome. If Newman had written in French, Italian, or Latin, then several of his books would have been on the *Index*. . . . Rome's influence is far more harmful and ruinous than I had even dreamed before 1860."

(*c*) Here, again, is what Döllinger said about the poisoning of history at the very source in Roman Catholic seminaries : it is contained in the same volume :[1] "Moreover, I undertake to prove that the bishops of the Romance countries, Spain, Italy, South America, and France, who formed the immense majority at Rome, together with their clergy, had already been misled on the matter of Papal authority by the text-books from which they had got their knowledge in the days of their seminary course ; seeing that the documentary proofs contained in these books are to a great extent false, invented, or garbled ; I will prove this first in the case of the two principal and favourite text-books in theological schools and seminaries of the present day—St. Alfonso Liguori's *Moral Theology* (especially the treatise on the Popes) and the *Theology* of the Jesuit Perrone ; secondly, in the case of Archbishop Cardoni's and Bishop Ghilardi's writings, which were distributed in Rome during the Council ; and, finally, in the case of the Viennese theologian Schwetz's *Theology*." The Archbishop's reply of three days later declined to discuss these questions, which had already been decided by the infallible voice of the Church, and simply excommunicated Döllinger in the words of St. Matthew xviii. 17, "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen and a publican."[2]

Döllinger's last public words on this subject were in 1887,

[1] P. 75 ; Letter to the Archbishop of Munich, March 28, 1871.

[2] Or, as the Archbishop himself wrote in German, "a heathen and a public sinner"—wie ein Heide und ein öffentlicher Sünder.

when the Papal nuncio wrote to ask whether "the most holy Virgin of the Rosary and your guardian angel" could not inspire him to retract and submit. He replied that he had first learned from his masters, and then taught as Professor for four years in the Catholic Theological Faculty of Munich, "that Papal Infallibility was an opinion of very late invention, tolerated at present in the Church; but that (in the words of a very widely circulated [Roman Catholic] catechism in English) it was a Protestant slander to assert that the whole Catholic world accepted the doctrine."[1] For this he had received no official rebuke till after 1870: and now, at 88 years of age, on the brink of the grave, he must decline to say the contrary of what he knew to be true in 1871, and was still more convinced of now. He added, "When the Archbishop (obeying, as he said, the Pope's orders) communicated my sentence to me, he sent me word that I was subject to all the pains decreed in Canon law against the excommunicate. The first and most important of those pains is contained in the celebrated Bull of Pope Urban II., which decides that any one may kill an excommunicated person, when the motive is zeal for the Church. At the same time the Archbishop caused sermons to be preached against me in all the pulpits of Munich; and the effect of these declamations was such that the Chief Constable warned me that attempts on my person were being plotted, and that I should do well never to go out unaccompanied. May I venture to raise the question, Monsignor, whether, in case I now submitted, I should be obliged to publish to the world that I look upon this decision of the Infallible Pope as perfectly conformable to Gospel morality? . . . What I have written here will suffice, I think, to show you that, with such convictions as mine, a man may have inward peace and quiet of mind even on the threshold of eternity."

APPENDIX III

Monsignor J. S. Vaughan's *Faith and Folly*

I reprint here a few sentences from my article in the *Contemporary Review* for December 1905.

[1] The Archbishop of Baltimore, in his *History of the Reformation* (5th ed. 1866), had also stigmatised it as a Protestant fiction: see J. Friedrich, *Doc. ad Conc. Vaticanum*, etc., vol. i. (1871), pp. 207-8.

"Monsignor J. S. Vaughan, Domestic Prelate to the Pope, and brother to the late Cardinal, in a book called *Faith and Folly*, had recently printed statistics designed to show an overwhelming preponderance of illegitimate births in Protestant countries. The editor of *The Catholic Times* challenged me to face these statistics, and I had no difficulty in showing that the good Prelate had obtained his favourable average by omitting altogether from his calculations *the three best Protestant countries* on the one hand, and *the four worst Catholic countries* on the other; moreover, even among the twelve names which remained after all this juggling, he improved his results by counting Prussia and Germany as separate states! Incredible as this may seem, still more incredible was his answer when I pointed it out. He found nothing better to plead in *The Catholic Times* than that all statistics are one degree worse than 'd—d lies,' quite forgetting that in *Faith and Folly* he had undertaken to prove the superiority of Romanist morality with no other argument than three bare tables of statistics, after which he had added, in triumph, 'these figures speak for themselves.' I pointed out this strange inconsistency; he vouchsafed no further explanation, and there the debate ended. A year later, however, this same Monsignor Vaughan wrote to *The Spectator* accusing Protestants of composing history from tainted sources (August 30, 1902); I therefore wrote in my turn recounting the *Faith and Folly* incident. Here, again, the distinguished Prelate relapsed into silence, though one of his co-religionists, apparently a layman, wrote in the next number confessing the shame and indignation which honest Romanists naturally feel at such exposures."

Nobody, I believe, has questioned my facts here; for in truth they are not very exceptional; they are almost typical. Many instances of the same kind may be found arraigned in a series of articles by a Roman Catholic who signs himself *Voces Catholicae*, in the *Contemporary Review* for 1899 and following years; to realise how difficult it is to meet that author's facts, the reader should peruse the answer of another Roman Catholic who undertook to defend his superiors (vol. lxvi. p. 90).

IV

COMMUNION OR MASS

BY

The Venerable W. L. PAIGE COX, B.D.

ARCHDEACON OF CHESTER AND CANON OF CHESTER CATHEDRAL

SYNOPSIS

Intention of the Anglican Reformers to change the Mass into a Communion.

Evidences in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, with later revisions.

Articles XXV.-XXXI.

The doctrine thus set forth assented to by every person ordained in the Church of England, and maintained and defended by a long succession of eminent divines.

Recent Movement to disregard the Reformation Settlement and restore the Mass.

Particulars in Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 1906.

Later developments.

The Mass advocated as Catholic.

Misuse of the word "Catholic."

The Vincentian formula.

The doctrine of the Mass a later corruption.

Aim of the Anglican Reformers to "restore the true and Catholic doctrine."

The Test of Holy Scripture.

The "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction."

The doctrine of "the presentation of the sacrifice in Heaven."

The Anamnesis.

General Objections to the Doctrine and Specific Ritual of the Mass.

It does not accord with the teaching of the New Testament about God the Father.

It tends to subvert belief in the universal and continual presence of Christ with His people.

It has not the warrant of Christ's ordinance.

It does not lay a rightly proportioned emphasis on the New Testament teaching concerning the sacrifices to be offered by Christian people.

It "has given occasion to many superstitions."

The Revival of the Mass in its Bearing on Reunion.

It causes division within the Church of England.

It tends to widen the breach between the Church of England and the other Reformed Communions.

A necessary basis for reunion is the general abstinence from dogmatism about things which Christ did not reveal and which need not and cannot be precisely defined.

The Church of England at the Reformation reverted to the Primitive usage in this regard.

Motives for reviving the Mass.

The imitation of Rome.

The difficulty of realising the Divine immanence.

The spectacular attractiveness of the Mass.

A More Excellent Way.

Possibilities of the Holy Communion as the central service of the Church.

The One Bread and One Body.

The opportunity of the Church of England as witnessing to "the true and Catholic doctrine."

ADDITIONAL NOTES

A. The Word "Mass."

B. The Word "Catholic."

IV

COMMUNION OR MASS

In the text-books of the Roman Catholic Church it is taught that at the Reformation in England the Mass was changed into a Communion Service. Till recently that has been recognised and admitted in our own text-books. Thus, in *The History of the Book of Common Prayer*, by Francis Procter, it is said of the Order of Communion which preceded the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., " It turned ' the Mass ' into ' the Communion.' "[1] That was certainly the intention of the Anglican Reformers. The title given to the Service in the Prayer Book of 1549 was " The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." Though the word " Mass " was used in the title, no doubt to denote the continuity of the service with that to which the people had been accustomed, the essential change in the character of the service was indicated by the priority given to the two Scriptural terms ; and throughout the service the term " Mass " is never used. It is always the " Holy Communion " or the " Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ."[2]

[1] P. 23, 14th edition, 1878.

[2] Dr. W. H. Frere, in his *New History of the Book of Common Prayer on the Basis of the former Work by Francis Procter*, speaks of the Communion Office of the First Prayer Book as " The English Mass of 1549 " (p. 450), and expresses himself most unaccountably as follows : " Other titles (referring to the word *Liturgy*) bring out other aspects of the same service which was called the *Mass* by the First Prayer Book, as was usual in the mediaeval and the Latin Church, but which in the later Prayer Books is called *The Lord's Supper* and *The Holy Communion* " (p. 432). See Additional Note A—The Word " Mass."

Cranmer, who took such a large part in the compilation of the First Prayer Book, declared some time before that the Sacrament was only "a memory and representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Its virtue was limited to the receivers of the communion, and the laity derived no benefit from private masses performed by priests." Accordingly, the doctrine of transubstantiation was excluded from the First Prayer Book, and the elevation and "shewing the Sacrament to the people" were left out. Stress was laid on the reception of the Holy Communion, two exhortations on the subject being inserted and a direction being given after the offertory to those that did not "mind to receive the Holy Communion" to "depart out of the quire."

There were, however, ambiguities in the service of which advantage was taken by those who clung to the unreformed doctrine, and this led to the revision of 1552. The sequence of the 1549 office was substantially that of the old Mass, and priests were able, by saying the words in an undertone and repeating the old manual acts, to make the new form indistinguishable from the Mass. In the 1552 office no room was left for this representation or misrepresentation. The service was so arranged as to exclude the ideas of sacrifice and corporal presence which had interpenetrated every word and action in the Mass. The word "altar" was expunged; the *Gloria in Excelsis*, instead of being placed at the beginning of the office and heralding the presence of God, was placed at the end; and the words "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" were omitted as implying the same conception.[1] The title of the service was then fixed to be what it is now, "The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion," the reference to the previous title of the service as unreformed being omitted.

Our present Communion Office is substantially

[1] See *Thomas Cranmer*, by Professor A. F. Pollard, pp. 272-73.

that of 1552, with such alterations as that the two forms of words used at the delivery of the elements according to the First and Second Prayer Books respectively are combined in it, and the words "corporal presence" are used instead of "real and essential" in the so-called Black Rubric at the end. The reason for this latter change would seem to have been that the realistic philosophy had lost its hold in the seventeenth century, and men were no longer familiar with the language of the schools, so that the denial of any "real and essential presence" might be considered a denial of any true presence whatever. The result is that any corporal presence in the Sacrament is denied by the Church of England. "The Sacramental Bread and Wine," as the rubric runs, "remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

In 1553 appeared the XLII. Articles, and ultimately, in 1571, the XXXIX. Articles, which, with the latter part of the Catechism added in 1604, support and expound the doctrine implied and set forth in the Communion Office. In the XXVIIIth Article, for instance, it is stated: "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's Ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." And, again, in the XXXIst Article it is said: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and

actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

This, then, is the doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ to which the Church of England has been committed since the sixteenth century. Every person since then ordained priest in the Church of England has been required to promise that he will "give his faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God ; and that he will teach the people committed to his cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same." And every priest, again, when instituted, collated, or licensed to a cure of souls has to make the following declaration : "I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the Doctrine of the Church of England, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God ; and in Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments I will use the Form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except as far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

This doctrine has been assented to by a long succession of divines representative of different schools of thought, and has been defended by men so eminent in their various ways as Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, Usher, Andrewes, Laud, Jeremy Taylor, Bull, and Waterland—not to mention the writers of such standard works of our own time on the Thirty-nine Articles as Bishops Harold Browne and Gibson.

The Movement to restore the Mass

At the present day we are face to face with a remarkable and unprecedented movement in the Anglican

Communion, if not openly to repudiate the doctrine of the Holy Communion as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles, at any rate to disregard it and to teach the opposite doctrine which was rejected at the Reformation. The name of Mass is substituted in the use of many Churches for the Prayer Book name of Lord's Supper or Holy Communion. The service is announced, as in the Roman Church, as "Holy Mass," prayers and ceremonies belonging to the canon of the Mass are interpolated into the service, and the service is rendered with such accessories as to suggest the Mass rather than the English Communion Service. People are taught that they may "assist at the Sacrifice" without communicating. The Sacrament is reserved under conditions which lead to its adoration. In some places the Roman Service of Benediction is in use and there are Corpus Christi processions with the Sacrament. A full enumeration of practices of this sort will be found on page 75 of the *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1906, where it is stated that "these practices have an exceptional character as being marked by all the three following characteristics: (1) They are clearly inconsistent with and subversive of the teaching of the Church of England as declared by the Articles and set forth in the Prayer Book; (2) they are illegal; and (3) their illegality cannot with any reason be held to depend upon judgements of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or to be affected by any view taken of the constitutional character of that tribunal." Whatever view be taken of the authority of the Royal Commission itself, it is at least worthy of note that the Report in which the above words occur was signed by representative Churchmen and legal authorities like Archbishop Davidson, Bishops Paget (of Oxford) and Gibson, Sir F. H. Jeune, Sir Lewis Dibdin, Mr. J. G. Talbot, and others.

That was in 1906. There has been a noteworthy

development since. The measures advocated by the Royal Commissioners for "preventing" or "repressing" the practices condemned by them have in few instances been taken; and those who were then on their defence are now not only advocating their opinions widely and energetically, but are seeking to dominate the Church of England.

The first question that must naturally occur to many minds in connection with the above-mentioned illegalities is, how those who commit them can act as they do without restraint from their consciences, considering the very solemn nature of their Ordination vows and other pledges. That, however, is not a question which will be dealt with in this place. Our present concern is with the curious mentality, rather than the perplexing morality, of those who are leading or who are caught into this reactionary movement. It is difficult to get to grips with the reasons by which they would commend the movement. It is not pretended that any new facts have come to light either from history or from a more exact Biblical exegesis which falsify the position taken up by the Anglican reformers. Neither has there been recently any powerful polemic outside our Communion tending to undermine the great fabric of Anglican apologetics which has been built up during the last four centuries. It seems to be quietly assumed that not only the Reformation settlement but all our distinctively Anglican theology must now be "scrapped." If it is asked why, we can get no definite answer. All we are told in favour of the revival of the Mass is that it is Catholic.

The Mass advocated as Catholic

It is this word Catholic which is used to colour and to justify the whole movement. Here, at any rate, we have something in the nature of an argument of which

we can take hold. The formula of Catholicity as given in the famous treatise of St. Vincentius of Lerins, the *Commonitorium*, is *quod semper*, *quod ubique*, *quod ab omnibus*, what has been held "always, everywhere, and by all." [1]

It is by that formula that the fundamentals of belief concerning God as revealed in Christ have been defended from very early days. The doctrine of the Trinity in Unity is maintained to be the Catholic Faith more especially as that which was held from the beginning, as well as in all quarters of the Church. Take away the *quod semper* from the canon of Catholicity and what remains of the chief argument for the genuineness of the Church's doctrine of God?

Now, if there is anything clearly verifiable in human history, it is that the doctrine of the Mass is not Catholic in the sense of having been held in the Christian Church from the beginning. This was always the strong contention of Cranmer. "As no Scripture," he says, "so no ancient author known and approved hath in plain terms your transubstantiation; nor that the body and blood of Christ be really, corporally, naturally, and carnally under the forms of bread and wine; nor that evil men do eat the very body and drink the very blood of Christ; nor that Christ is offered every day by the priest a sacrifice propitiatory for sin." [2] One of the main treatises in which Cranmer sets forth his views bears the title of the *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*. Whatever personal weaknesses Cranmer may have had, and it ought ever to be remembered that he was called upon to play his part in the Church in circumstances of unparalleled difficulty, he was undeniably a fine scholar; he knew the significance to be attached to Catholicity in the

[1] See Additional Note B—The Word "Catholic."
[2] *Works*, i. 13.

original and proper sense of the term ; and he was most careful in all he did to make no break with anything in the Church's traditional system which was demonstrably sound and true and was in conformity with the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the primitive Church.

We have indeed cause to be thankful as English Churchmen that those who were the chief agents under God in the compilation of our formularies and the revision of our worship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were men of such profound learning and well-balanced judgement. As Archbishop Benson put it in a speech of his in Convocation on May 5, 1893: "It is of immense importance to recognise that the Reformation of the Church of England was conducted by persons of very high capacity and the very largest knowledge. If they had not taken their stand as Reformers they would have been accounted amongst the greatest of Schoolmen that the Church has ever known. They took a finer and higher line for the sake of mankind."

It is easy to see, then, that the Mass is only to be described as Catholic if that term is used to denote what is mediaeval or Roman. The fully-developed doctrine of the Mass unquestionably had its origin in the later Middle Ages, and it followed on the acceptance of the dogma of transubstantiation. The change is summarily described by Bishop Harold Browne as follows : "When the doctrine of transubstantiation had once been invented and defined, the doctrine of the fathers concerning the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist would be perverted into the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. That doctrine is plainly enough expressed in the Canons of the Council of Trent. Herein it is forbidden to deny that a true and proper sacrifice is offered to God—that Christ made His Apostles priests on purpose that they might offer His Body and Blood

—that there is a propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions—that it profits others as well as the partakers, etc.

"From the belief that in the Mass there was a true offering up of Christ, not only for the benefit of the receiver, but anew for the sins of the whole world, came naturally the custom that the priest should offer the sacrifice, but the people should not communicate. Among the early Christians all who did not communicate left the Church.[1] But, when the doctrine of the Mass was once established, the people stayed to witness the offering up of the sacrifice, which they believed to be profitable both to them and to all the world, though the priest alone offered it, and the priest alone received. The Eucharist had, in fact, ceased to be a Sacrament. It had become, in the belief of the majority, a propitiatory offering, not a covenanting rite."[2]

The other distinguishing feature of the Mass besides the propitiatory offering is the adoration of the Host. Nothing can be clearer than that this practice has no support from Christian antiquity. Bingham is most emphatic in saying, "There was no adoration of the Host before the twelfth or thirteenth century. . . . The ancients never allowed non-communicants to stay and worship the Eucharist as the practice now is, which yet had been very proper had they believed the Eucharist to be their God. But they used it for Communion, not for adoration."[3] This is admitted

[1] "The practice of the modern Romish Church contrasts strikingly with this: they not only allow catechumens to be present at their *missa fidelium*, but also heretics and unbelievers, and make a profit by the exhibition: in this, again, the English Church more nearly resembles the primitive Church, retaining her sensitive seclusion during the solemn service." Dean Hook, *A Church Dictionary*, p. 480.

[2] *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 744 (10th edition). With reference to the last paragraph quoted from Bishop Harold Browne, it may be mentioned that among the demands made at a popular rising in 1549 were the following: "That the Latin Mass should be revived with no communicants except the priest, that there should be compulsory worship of the Sacrament and the execution of all recusants as heretics, and that the Sacrament should be distributed but once a year —at Easter—and then in one kind only."

[3] *Antiquities*, Book XV. chap. v.

by Roman liturgiologists. Thus Mr. Edmund Bishop, in his *Genesis of the Roman Rite*, referring to the adoration of the Host, says, "What in the Roman Mass is considered most picturesque, or attractive, or devout, or effective—in a word, what is most interesting—forms precisely that element in it which is not Roman at all, but of foreign accretion in the course of the centuries." [1]

When Mr. Bishop speaks of the "foreign accretion" in the Mass he sets us thinking on the probable origin of the distinctive features of that service. We do not find them in the primitive celebration of the Sacrament. They were obviously not part of the original Christian tradition. Everything seems to point to Bishop Lightfoot's conclusion, that they were due to Gentile influences, it being a significant thing that it is in Latin Christendom as represented by the Church of Carthage that the germs of the sacerdotal idea appear first, and soonest ripen to maturity.[2] Apparently, it was "a distinct innovation, and an innovation due, not to development in adapting the ideas of Christianity to new circumstances, but to the influence of conceptions of God and of the means of appeasing His anger, which were current in the Gentile environment but were alien to the conceptions of Jesus." [3] No doubt a large number of the converts to Christianity in the darker ages, when the advanced doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice arose, but imperfectly assimilated the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, and were prone to transfer to the Christian God some of the attributes of the deities they had renounced. It would seem as though they looked upon the First Person of the Trinity as remote, unapproachable,

[1] So Dr. A. Fortescue (R.C.) in *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy*: "The mediaeval ceremony of the elevation has tended to become a new centre of gravity for the Mass. A rite unknown till the twelfth century cannot be of first importance in any liturgy. We must teach our people that the essence of the Mass is not the elevation, but consecration and communion."

[2] *The Christian Ministry*, p. 123.

[3] *The Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History*, by D. M. Ross, D.D., p. 188.

and austere, so that there was need to propitiate Him daily with the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ, in re-enactment of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Moreover, as this sacrifice was in popular usage dissociated mostly from communion, it presents the appearance of a revival of that ancient kind of sacrifice which was offered to unpropitious gods and was not participated in by those who offered it.[1]

The Test of Holy Scripture

The doctrine of the Mass, then, is not Catholic; it is not part of the primitive Christian tradition. Nor is it a legitimate development from that tradition, but, as it would seem, an alien accretion on it. Most certainly the doctrine is not Scriptural. This came clearly to light in the sixteenth century, when the Bible again became an open book. There was no mistaking then the fact, as stated in our Prayer of Consecration, that Christ made upon the Cross, "by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." There is no need to quote the Scriptural proofs of this: they have been brought together again and again in our standard theology.

But notwithstanding the express teachings of Scripture about the "offering of Christ once made,"[2] it is maintained by some and dogmatically taught in popular manuals that Christ is continually offering Himself in Heaven as Victim on our behalf and that the Mass, or the Holy Eucharist, as celebrated by the priest, is the earthly counterpart of that heavenly offering. Our masters of Biblical exegesis will have none of this doctrine. "Heaven," says Dr. Swete, "is not a place of sacrifice, and our Lord is no longer a Sacrificing Priest; He has *offered one sacrifice for*

[1] See F. B. Jevons, *Comparative Religion*, pp. 28-29. [2] Article XXXI.

sins for ever. But His presence in the Holiest is a perpetual and effective presentation before God of the Sacrifice once offered. He Himself, as He sits on the Throne, in the perfected and glorified Manhood which has been obedient unto death, is the living Propitiation for our sins, and the standing guarantee of acceptance to all *that draw near unto God through Him.*"[1]

It is to be remarked further that, even if it were the fact that Christ is continually offering Himself in Heaven, we should have no authority for thinking that the object of the Holy Eucharist was that we should make the same offering on earth. "There is no logical sequence. There is not a word in the Communion Service to suggest such an opinion. It does not turn our thoughts to any transaction in the heavenly sanctuary, but to that which took place in the guest-chamber in Jerusalem."[2]

An attempt has been made to import a sacrificial meaning into the words of our Lord in instituting the Sacrament as recorded in 1 Corinthians xi. 24, and in St. Luke xxii. 19 (in certain MSS.): "This do in remembrance of Me." The words have been represented as meaning, "Offer this sacrifice as my memorial before God." Such a rendering was unknown to the Greek Fathers and the early Liturgies. It was suggested to the Council of Trent, but was rejected by it. As one Roman commentator put it, "It is plainly contrary to the mind of Scripture." There is no need to go into detail in refuting the misrepresentation. It has been fully and conclusively dealt with by Bishop Robertson and Dr. Plummer

[1] *The Ascended Christ*, p. 43. Reference might also be made to the judgement of another of the famous Cambridge Biblical Scholars, Dr. Hort, who said in one of his letters: "The idea expressed in the hymn, 'Still His prevailing death He pleads,' has no Apostolic warrant and cannot even be reconciled with Apostolic doctrine. The Bible seems to me to teach us to think of the Atonement as a thing done 'once for all.' What is said of intercession seems to belong simply to the presenting of human prayers as the Head of the race" (*Life*, vol. ii. 213).

[2] Bishop Thirlwall, *Charges*, ii. 245.

in their *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, in the International Critical Commentary Series, and by Dr. Plummer in his *Commentary on St. Luke* in the same series.

Of course, in carrying out the commandment, "Do this in remembrance of Me," [1] we make our commemoration as in God's presence and before Him. But we do it, not with the object of reminding Him of what He does not need to be reminded of, nor with a view to placate or propitiate Him by a reference to the Sacrifice of the Cross, for "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." We approach the Father in humble thanksgiving for His "tender mercy" towards us (to quote the language of the Prayer of Consecration) in that He gave "His only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption," our attitude being that of those who are entitled to draw near to Him only as members of Christ and by virtue of what Christ has done and is doing for them.

General Objections to the Mass

We may now pass on to a rapid survey of the principal objections to the Mass.

(1) It suggests a conception of God the Father which is not in accordance with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. The specific details of the ritual, the general attitude of the celebrant, the genuflections, the prostrations, the frequent bowings of the attendant clergy and acolytes or servers, the exclusive use of the word altar instead of Lord's Table—all this, conforming as it does so noticeably with what was customary in Pagan worship, seems to be adapted to a lower and more primitive conception of God as of One having the attributes of an arbitrary and

[1] Or "to remember Me." So Bishop Gore puts it. "This phrase," he says, "goes back to very early times." *The Body of Christ*, p. 318 (3rd edition).

vengeful earthly Potentate, different *toto coelo* from Him Whom Jesus described for us in saying, "I and My Father are One." The Mass thus tends to keep alive the old popular antithesis between the Father conceived as manifesting the justice and wrath of God and the Son as manifesting the suffering, self-sacrificing love of God. It is needless to say that in the teaching of our Lord there is no such antithesis. It is the Father's love which calls and inspires Him "to seek and to save" the lost children of His Father. Everywhere and always it is the heart and will of the Father which the Son reveals. "Few things are more disheartening to the philosophical student of religion," says Dr. Pringle-Pattison, "than the way in which the implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation are evaded in popular theology by dividing the functions of the Deity between the Father and the Son."[1] Moreover, the supposed remoteness and alienation of the Father on account of man's sin is nowhere justified by the Apostolic teaching. "No New Testament writer says that God was reconciled to man; God is always Love, and it is man that needs to be brought back to Him that His love may be satisfied. God's necessary, inevitable attitude to sin (described as wrath) is entirely compatible with His love for sinners. Sin is so hateful that His love wants to save us from it. And when St. Paul, using the language of Old Testament sacrifice, speaks of Christ as 'propitiatory' (Romans iii. 25), he does not say that God is propitiated; the sin is done away, and the sinner forgiven, *i.e.* brought back into the union with Him that sin had broken."[2] It may be remarked that this view of the meaning of propitiation is borne out by the evidence of the papyri, which show from the common use of the word in New Testament times that it cannot be taken to denote a person or

[1] *The Idea of God*, p. 409.
[2] Professor A. H. McNeile, *St. Paul*, p. 301.

a propitiatory sacrifice, but a "propitiatory gift"; thus "Christ is set forth as the votive gift of the divine love for the salvation of men."[1]

Now all this is falsified in the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, with its specific ritual. It obscures, even so as to impugn the doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that little stress is laid on the Fatherhood of God in Roman teaching or in teaching which is assimilated to it. Nor do we hear much in such teaching of the Holy Spirit and His direct influence upon souls. We hear much more of the ministries of created beings —angels or saints—as mediators between men and the remote and unapproachable God. Bishop Neville Talbot, in his *Thoughts on Religion at the Front*, tells how he was once very much startled by "an eminently pious Anglo-Catholic undergraduate at Oxford" saying to him, "The fact is, I am not interested in God the Father." There you have an illustration of the effect likely to be produced on the religion of the people if there were a general revival of the Mass amongst us. It would undermine belief in the primary article of our Faith.

(2) A second very grave objection to the Mass is that it tends to subvert belief in the continual presence of Christ with His people. The course and significance of the ritual at the celebration of the Mass, or of the Holy Eucharist as imitative of the Mass, have been thus described: "First the Altar Lights are lit, giving the expectation of the coming of the Lord, then the strains of the Benedictus, 'Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord,' seem to herald His coming. At length at the consecration rite He Who has been absent is now present, the Church that before that moment was dark and void is now ablaze with the light of His glory, and bells are rung to announce it to those outside." All this is adapted to the doctrine

[1] See *The New Archaeological Discoveries*, by C. M. Cobern, p. 34.

that by the action of the priest Christ is brought down to His "Altar throne," the bread and wine are then and there changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, or, as it is otherwise put, Christ becomes really present on the altar under the forms of bread and wine.[1]

"This is for a brief moment only. The service comes to an end, the elements are consumed, the lights are extinguished, and He Who came has now gone."[2]

How does this accord with Christ's own teaching: "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the age,"[3] and again, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them"?[4] The promise of His perpetual presence with His disciples was one of the most precious of the Lord's legacies to them. Throughout the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles we can see how greatly it nerved and inspired them, as it has given strength and consolation to millions of Christ's followers since. What becomes, too, in the light of this later Eucharistic doctrine, of the assurance of the Lord that every meeting of His disciples for worship and service was to be hallowed by His real presence? No wonder that the opinion should become current, when this assurance is overlooked, that there is no particular blessing to be found in Matins or Evensong or other such services of prayer and praise. We make no mistake in regard-

[1] On this doctrine, which, like others that have been mentioned, is being taught dogmatically in popular manuals in the English Church as though it were incontrovertible, see Appendix: Bishop Jayne on *Reservation*.

It may be mentioned here that the doctrine of the adorable presence under the forms of bread and wine received no more countenance from men of the school of Andrewes and Laud, Cosin and Bramhall, Hammond and Jeremy Taylor, than from Hooker and Usher in the seventeenth century and Cranmer and Ridley in the sixteenth. Andrewes, for example, said in reply to the French Cardinal, Duperron, "The terms of *sous les espèces*, or *dans les espèces sacramentales*, it would pose the Cardinal and all the whole college to find that they were ever heard or dreamt of in St. Augustine's time, or many hundred years after" (*Minor Works*, p. 14). Again, in a passage in his Latin sermon on the occasion of the departure of the Prince Palatine from England, Andrewes exclaims: "Let them adore a Deity, *veiled under the forms*, a Deity made in a baker's oven; but Sion would shudder at this, and flee from it." The above quotations are taken from *Define your Terms*, by Bishop Dowden, in which the whole subject is exhaustively treated.

[2] Bishop Walpole, *The Shrine and the Presence*, chap. x.

[3] St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

[4] St. Matt. xviii. 20.

ing the Holy Communion as the chief, and, in a sense, the most sacred of all services ; but that is not, and cannot be, because Christ is present at that service and only there, or more present there than at other services. There cannot be degrees of presence. Either a person is present in a certain place at a given time or he is not present. No doubt, the character of the Holy Communion is such that we can very specially realise Christ's presence there—more easily and naturally, perhaps, than at other services ; but it is a very grievous and misleading error to emphasise the presence there in an exclusive way, which is the effect of the ritual and doctrine of the Mass. As a matter of fact, there is no mention at all of the real presence in the New Testament in connection with the Holy Communion. The great distinguishing blessing of the Sacrament is something more than the presence of Christ, it is that of vital union with Him through partaking of His Body and Blood.[1]

(3) The Holy Communion is very commonly spoken of as "the Lord's own service."[2] It is that in a special sense as having been originated by Him. Well, then, the essential features of the "Lord's own service" must, of course, be such as He appointed, but there is no warrant from Christ for the two distinctive features of the Mass. That which in the Mass is "most picturesque, or attractive, or devout, or

[1] Since writing the above I have looked anew at the pamphlet by Bishop Gore on the *Extra-liturgical Uses of the Blessed Sacrament*, which concludes as follows : "I find that the only part of the Church which has encouraged the use (the later Western Church of the Roman obedience) does, in fact, deny that doctrine of the inward presence of the Manhood in the Church and in all its members which is the rich heritage of real Catholicism. It denies it not formally as by a dogma of the Church, but really by the consent of theologians, so that it is not, I believe, permissible for Roman Catholic writers to affirm it."

[2] The term is misleading if it is intended to imply that other services such as Morning and Evening Prayer are not His services too. They are in direct descent from the synagogue services which He regularly attended (St. Luke iv. 16). These services consisted of prayers, psalms, reading of Holy Scripture, and sermon, and were carried over into the Christian Church (Acts ii. 42). The promise of His presence with the two or three gathered together in His name gave His special sanction and benediction to these services.

effective—in a word, the adoration of the Host," is not of Christ's institution. "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." [1] On the contrary, such worship is plainly repugnant to the teaching of Christ. It is certainly not according to His mind and will and His constant attitude towards the Father that the highest devotion of the worshippers at the chief service of the Church should be concentrated on Himself. "As mediator He is ever leading men on beyond Himself, for He is Son, and it is His joy to glorify the Father. . . . Devotion to the Father's Will was not merely one principle or law or obligation of His life, it was the root of His whole being. . . . It was ever the Father's Honour, the Father's Will, the Father's Love, that determined His actions and inspired His words. His prayer just before He died was, 'Father, glorify the Son, that the Son may glorify Thee.' The adoration of the Host changes all this and places the Son on the Father's throne. It incurs what Dr. Bigg called that 'grave danger that the Father has, in appearance at any rate, been obscured behind the Son as the Son in His turn behind the Virgin and the Saints.'" [2]

Further, there is no warrant from the ordinance of Christ for the doctrine that the Sacrament of His Body and Blood is a propitiatory sacrifice to His Father. We have already noticed the strained interpretation that some have sought to put on the Lord's words in instituting His memorial as recorded in 1 Cor. xi. 23 and in certain MSS. of St. Luke. The plain meaning of the words, as understood all down the centuries, is "Perform this action (continue to take bread, give thanks, and break it) in remembrance of Me." [3] What-

[1] Article XXVIII.

[2] Bishop Walpole, *The Shrine and the Presence*, chap. x.

[3] A similar attempt is made to strain the meaning of the word "show" (R.V. "proclaim") in 1 Cor. xi. 26, "Ye do show the Lord's death till He come," as though it meant "show to the Father"; but the word in the original has elsewhere

ever the meaning of the words may be supposed to be, they are not found in the first two Gospels. Those who had only one or other of those Gospels before them could have had no glimmering of any idea of the Sacrament being a memorial to God, a sacrificial offering to Him of Christ's Body and Blood, even if the Pauline words could be so understood. Really the narrative of the Last Supper in any of the Gospels speaks for itself. Consider the circumstances of the guest-chamber, the arrangement of the couches, the furnished table, and the Lord's preliminary words, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." All is suggestive of a sacred meal. It was the thought of eating and drinking in holy fellowship with His disciples that was in the Lord's mind, right on to the time when He gave the final promise, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom."[1] They were to receive from Him at the Supper the bread and the wine as His Body and Blood; but how could He have meant them to believe that the bread and wine as thus hallowed by Him were changed in substance, when He Himself was there visibly before them, holding the consecrated elements in His hands? Plainly, so far as the sacred narratives show, the Sacrament of His Body and Blood was intended by Christ to be a "Communion and not a Mass."[2]

(4) A further objection to the Mass is that it does not lay a rightly proportioned emphasis on the teaching

---

the sense of "announcing," "preaching." "The Eucharist is an *acted* sermon, an *acted* proclamation of the death which it commemorated." See International Critical Commentary *in loco*.

It may be remarked here that any real repetition of the Sacrifice of Christ would involve a repetition of His sufferings. As a matter of fact, when Christ instituted the Sacrament He had not yet been sacrificed.

[1] St. Luke xxii. 29, 30.

[2] It may incidentally be remarked here that no authority from Christ Himself can be quoted for making fasting communion compulsory. It is an ancient custom that may be commended to those who from age and circumstances can reasonably observe it; but any who press it further as a duty are strangely confronted by the words "As they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it," etc.

of the New Testament concerning the sacrifices to be offered by Christian people. The approach made to God in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ is largely of a sacrificial character ; but that approach is more correctly provided for in our Communion Office than in the Mass. The service is in its essence a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and there is an underlying reference to that sacrifice in all the prayers and praises that are addressed to God. In the Mass attention is concentrated on the *re-offering* of that sacrifice, which is not necessary and is not enjoined, and is not, properly speaking, on our part a sacrificial act at all. We give up nothing, we dedicate nothing of our own when we merely "offer Christ" as a substitutory victim for ourselves. It is different with the real and personal sacrifices which we are called upon in the New Testament to offer—the sacrifice of the humble and contrite heart, of our alms and oblations, of our praises and thanksgivings—the outcome, as they should be, of much earnest thought and devout feeling—culminating in the "living" and "reasonable" sacrifice of "ourselves, our souls and bodies." Such sacrifices are fully and most aptly provided for in our Communion Office. We there "acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness." We "humbly beseech God most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations." We ask Him "to receive our prayers which we offer unto His Divine Majesty." We "entirely desire His Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." And then, having confessed our sins and received God's absolution, we draw near to the Lord's Table, and being "assured" anew, through the reception of the Sacrament, of our "incorporation in the Mystical Body of Christ," we together make our entire self-dedication to God in the Prayer of Oblation which follows. This last, as Bishop Gore has reminded us, is "the very spirit and essence of St. Augustine's teaching about the

Eucharistic sacrifice . . . for, according to Augustine, the chief point about the Eucharist is that therein the Church offers *herself* through Christ, as His body, to the Father—the body identifying itself with the sacrifice of the Head, and realising in her ' holy fellowship ' the identity of spirit which binds her to Christ." [1] It will be noticed how appropriately from this point of view the Prayer of Oblation occupies its present position in the Prayer Book. This has been remarked with emphasis by Professor Burkitt in his valuable pamphlet on *Eucharist and Sacrifice*.[2]

(5) Yet another objection to the Mass can hardly be left without mention, as it is made prominent in the XXVIIIth Article. " It hath given occasion to many superstitions." Of one of these superstitions a warning is given in the rubric at the end of the Communion Office. " The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored ; (for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians)." If it be objected that it is not the Bread and Wine which are adored but Christ present in them, the answer given by that keen logician, Archbishop Whateley, is, that, if that does not constitute idolatry, what does ? " Will it be said that Idolatry consists in worshipping a piece of wood as *such*—as a mere piece of wood ? Whoever was, or can be, guilty of that ? The thing is not only practically impossible, but is inconceivable, and is a contradiction in terms. The most grossly-minded Israelite that ever offered up his prayers before a golden calf implied, by that very act, his belief that it was something more than a mere piece of gold, and that there resided in it a certain divine intelligence. If therefore a Romanist

[1] *The Body of Christ*, p. 329 (3rd edition).

[2] It is only possible within the limits of an essay to touch on salient points. The subject of the sacrificial element in the service of the Holy Communion is very fully dealt with in *The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Holy Communion*, by the late Canon Meyrick, with a preface by Bishop Harold Browne.

adores the true God under the form of bread, he is clearly as much guilty of idolatry as the Israelites in worshipping the golden calf, it being thus only, that any one *can* practise idolatry."[1] Our leading divines, from the sixteenth century onwards, have consistently taught thus. No more on the subject need be said than in these words of Bishop Jeremy Taylor: "It is a fit address in the day of solemnity, with a *sursum corda*, with our hearts *lift up to heaven*, where Christ sits (we are sure) at the right hand of the Father; but to terminate the Divine Worship to the Sacrament, to that which we eat, is so unreasonable and unnatural, and withal so scandalous, that Averroes, observing it to be used among the Christians with whom he had the ill-fortune to converse, said these words: 'Since Christians worship what they eat, let my soul be with the philosophers.'"

Of other superstitions that have been associated with the Mass no special mention need be made here beyond the mediaeval stories of alleged miracles "such as those freely instanced by Paschasius Radbert, in which the Host has disappeared, and the Infant Christ Himself been seen, or where drops of blood have been seen to flow from the consecrated wafer. Of these none is more to the point than the so-called miracle of Bolsena, which led to the institution of the Festival of Corpus Christi in 1264. According to one account, the miracle, in which the corporal was suddenly covered with red spots in the shape of a Host, actually happened to remove the priest's doubts concerning Transubstantiation."[2] If it be urged that we may safely revive such observances as those of Corpus Christi in these days because people are so much more enlightened than when the festival was first instituted, the answer is that human nature is radically the same now as then, the roots of superstition go deep into

[1] *Essays on the Errors of Romanism*, pp. 6 and 7 (5th edition).
[2] Bishop Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii. p. 658.

the far past, and, as a matter of fact, we see instances all around us that humanity is as credulous as it ever was.

The Revival of the Mass and Christian Reunion

It remains to notice how the revival of the Mass bears on the question of Reunion. On this there are two things that call for special remark.

(1) It has caused division within the Church of England. All over the country, more particularly in the south, there have been disturbances in parishes through the forcing of High Mass, or Choral Eucharists imitative of High Mass, on an unwilling people. Ordinary church-goers have been called upon to put in a non-communicating attendance, in company with their children, at such services, in place of the Morning Prayer to which they have been accustomed, followed by Holy Communion for adults. The result has been much pained discontent on the part of very many, with, in places, a large falling-away from church attendance altogether.

Whatever success might here and there attend these attempts to re-model our Morning Services after the pattern of Rome, there could never be anything but disunion as the general result, for people would still have our Prayer Book Services and teaching before them to show the erroneous and illegal character of these innovations ; and, moreover, with the open Bible in their hands, all persons of thoughtful and serious mind would note the inconsistency between the doctrine and ritual of the Mass and the Scriptural account of the Last Supper. If the majority of church-going Christians went Romanist or mediaevalist in type to-morrow, there would remain outside the circle of such worshippers a great multitude of Christian people of equal claim to be members of the Church

of England, yet fundamentally at variance with them on matters of the deepest moment.

(2) The substitution of the Mass for the Holy Communion tends to widen the breach between the Church of England and the other Reformed Communions. In the summer of 1920 the Bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference made their notable "Appeal to all Christian People" on the subject of reunion. They reaffirmed what has been called the "Lambeth Quadrilateral," viz. the four articles which "supply a basis on which approach may be made towards Home Reunion." Of these articles, the only one on which they dilate in their appeal is the fourth, the "historic Episcopate"; and special proposals are put forth for dealing with the difficulties which, as experience has shown, stand in the way of the general adoption of the historic Episcopate. Nothing is said of the other three Articles, for it is taken for granted that they raise no difficulties. It appears that the great bulk of our non-episcopal brethren would be willing to come to terms with us on the basis of the Holy Scriptures as "the rule and ultimate standard of faith," the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as "the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith," and "the Divinely instituted Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ." There seems no reason to suppose that there would be any objection to our Communion Office and to our doctrine concerning the Holy Communion; on the contrary, a readiness has often been shown to join in our Communion Services.

As for the general belief among non-episcopal Christians with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Laud, in his controversy with Fisher, maintained that in his day there was agreement among "Protestants of all sorts" with the doctrine of the Church of England concerning the "true and real

presence of Christ in the Eucharist, unless A.C. can make a Body no Body, and Blood no Blood (as perhaps he can by Transubstantiation), as well as Bread no Bread, and Wine no Wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too."[1] No doubt there is similar agreement now on a large scale, especially in the leading denominations, though in some quarters there may be defects, and rather serious defects, of Eucharistic doctrine. Evidences of substantial agreement are not difficult to find. The form of Communion Service, for example, prepared for the meeting of the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland in 1917 contains doctrine identical with our own. There is no more exact expression of such teaching concerning the Lord's Supper as is given in the Church Catechism to be found anywhere than in the discourse on "Frequent Communion," which forms one of the touchingly beautiful death-bed addresses published under the title of *Adolphe Monod's Farewell*. Of course, there are questions at issue between us and our non-episcopal brethren in reference to the mode of administering the Lord's Supper and the authority and status of the officiant. The point before us now, however, is that the Prayer Book doctrine of the Holy Communion seems to present no difficulties to them. They are, however, utterly opposed to the Mass—on the main ground, no doubt, as with our Anglican Reformers, that it is not consistent with the teaching of Holy Scripture "as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith." Any movement, therefore, on the part of the Church of England towards the readoption of the Mass must be a movement away from that sound and central basis on which only Reunion is possible, and must tend to stultify the Lambeth Appeal.

Dr. Headlam, in his *Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*, has affirmed "three main pro-

[1] *Conference with Fisher*, p. 192 (3rd edition), 1673.

positions. First, that the emphasis on the particular form of belief in the Eucharist is quite contrary to all the feelings and beliefs of the undivided Christian Church. Secondly, that the chief cause of division between different bodies of Christians has been the attempt to make dogmatic systems on questions of Eucharistic belief. And, thirdly, that the only hope of Christian union is not in any formula to which all may agree, but in recognising that all can join in accepting a common Liturgical worship." [1]

When the Lord uttered His memorable saying, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world," there were those who at once asked the question, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" It was one of those questions, suggested by a vain curiosity, which Christ would not answer. It was no more needful for men to have the mystery of spiritual feeding explained to them in order to derive benefit from Christ's gift of the living bread than it was for men to know all about the processes of physical digestion in order to be duly nourished by material food. So the only reply made was in the form of an emphatic reaffirmation of the original saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves." [2]

The Early Church was content to act on this assurance in reverent faith. In course of time, however, explanations of the mystery were attempted and enforced upon the acceptance of Christian people with the eventual result of widespread disunion. At the Reformation the Church of England was happily led to revert to the Scriptural and primitive position of obedience to Christ's teaching without building unauthorised theories upon it. She has in her Prayer Book, as it has been well said, "a type of Eucharistic doctrine, as distinctive as that in any other service-

[1] P. 272. [2] St. John vi. 52, 53.

book, and its special character is found in the disposition to emphasise what is Scripturally certain, and leave aside that which is inferential, and therefore in some measure precarious." [1]

The practical wisdom, the devout common-sense of this has been expressed once for all in the famous words of Richard Hooker—"Let it be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's Table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or enquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise: let disputes and questions, enemies to piety, abatements of true devotion, and hitherto in this cause but over patiently heard, let them take their rest. . . . What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God, Thou art true, O my Soul, thou art happy!" [2]

Motives for reviving the Mass

When the objections to the Mass are so grave and so various, it is difficult indeed to understand why the attempt should be made to revive it in the Church of England. The motives for the attempt may be conjectured to be such as these. First, there may be the desire to draw closer to the Church of Rome—a desire fostered and strengthened by the supposition that that great section of the Western Church, so conservative and so successful in maintaining its popularity with a certain type of minds, may have been all along in the right on this as on other points of doctrine and practice. No comment

[1] *The Real Presence*, by Dr. Strong (now Bishop of Ripon), p. 108.
[2] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 67, 12.

on this motive is needed here, as it has been so fully dealt with in other parts of this volume.

A probable attraction towards the Mass in some minds may be the tendency to conceive God too exclusively as transcendent. This, as we have seen, was the mediaeval tendency, and it still survives. The doctrine of transubstantiation was an attempt to modify the conception of God as transcendent and to represent Him as immanent in the bread and wine of the Sacrament. Our most recent philosophy has laid a new emphasis on the Divine immanence and taught us especially to associate it with the evolutionary process in nature. As this teaching sinks more and more into men's minds from the spread of scientific education, and, more particularly, as men learn from the teaching of Christ and His Apostles in Holy Scripture to recognise God's immanence in the human heart and conscience, there will be a less and less appeal of this sort in the distinctive doctrine of the Mass, for men will learn better how to balance the Divine transcendence with the Divine immanence in their common thought of God.

Perhaps the principal cause of such acceptance as the revival or imitation of the Mass has obtained has been its aesthetic and emotional impressiveness. A good many persons who are not specially interested in theological doctrine are attracted by music, by pageantry, and the pictorial beauty of ritualistic services. This is a reaction, in part, from the dulness and dreariness of the services of a past generation, from which we all, more or less, have experienced a feeling of revolt. The pendulum has swung to the opposite side, and now there is a very general craving for what is tasteful and beautiful in public worship. It is a proper and legitimate craving, and the Church ought to satisfy it, but in a right and wise way.

A More Excellent Way

There is no need to look to Rome to supply us with what we want. We can have it without departing in the slightest degree from the principles and ritual of our own Communion Office. Not long since, when the writer was spending a Sunday alone in London, he strayed into a church at the West-end, and joined in a Communion Service there. The church was a beautiful one, tastefully adorned in every way. The eye was attracted at once to the reredos, a representation, apparently in white marble, of the Last Supper, the figures in half relief, the whole being electrically lighted in a subdued way from an unseen source. The service was choral. There were no interpolations, the parts that were sung being those that are appointed to be sung or said, such as the *Ter Sanctus* and the *Gloria in Excelsis*. There was a very large congregation—it was at mid-day—and one and all communicated, the choir with the people. Nothing could have been more suggestive, under modern conditions, of the Lord's Supper as originally instituted. The beautiful piece of sculpture at the East End helped much towards the realisation of the Lord's own presence as the Dispenser of the Sacred Feast. The worshippers were celebrating together the Memorial of His Death as He instituted it; and, receiving as from Him the sacred symbols of His Body and Blood, became most wonderfully conscious of their communion with Him and with one another. So, at any rate, it seemed to one of them.

There has been a need for giving more prominence in these days to the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Church is much indebted to the High Church party for leading the way in this. Greater frequency and regularity of Communion is certainly warranted by Scriptural and Primitive precedent, and it must make for spiritual edification and the promotion

of Christian unity when rightly contrived. The multiplication of services on one day is not indeed in accordance with Primitive or Eastern custom, yet there is much to be said for the early administration of the Sacrament for those who like the quiet service at the beginning of the day. It is the great Communions, however, which should be aimed at ; and there must be no bar, such as that of insistence on fasting communion, to the attendance at these services of persons of all ages and conditions.

It is our corporate fellowship as members of Christ that needs to be emphasised and cemented on such supreme occasions of worship. That fellowship—the *Koinonia*—was the immediate product of the outpouring of the Spirit ; and untold gifts and achievements for the Church and the world were to proceed from it. Every care must be taken to promote and maintain the fellowship by the manner in which the great service is conducted. The guiding principles of the New Testament in matters of worship must be scrupulously adhered to. The supreme act of adoration must be directed, as is unquestionably right, to the Triune God, as when we join " with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven," in singing " Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory." There must be no jarring ritual introduced into the service in the form of gestures and genuflections suggestive of unauthorised theories concerning the consecrated elements about which men cannot agree. And the service should be essentially and most evidently a Communion Service, such as Christ instituted, not primarily and almost exclusively a service of oblation or of thanksgiving in which man's action is made more prominent than God's. The symbol of the " fellowship " is the " loaf " of which all partake and which is representative of the One Body ; and the effect of the service is inevitably spoiled when, mingled

with the communicants, are many—perhaps the larger number—who are present to "assist," but not to receive. The compilers of the Prayer Book of 1549 were well advised when they directed that those not intending to communicate should "depart out of the quire."[1] No doubt it would call for special arrangement, whether by the appointment of sub-deacons or otherwise, to provide conveniently for these frequent great communions, but the thing is possible and should be done.

Here is an exceptional opportunity before the Church of England. She has, in the Providence of God, specially identified herself with "the true and Catholic doctrine" of the Holy Communion as held persistently in practically all schools of thought in the Christian Church from the first institution of the Sacrament to the present day. Some, here and there, may have fallen short of the full doctrine, others may have overlaid it with unauthorised additions; but substantially all have believed that the Sacrament was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby," and that "the body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

It is most earnestly to be desired that the Church of England will stand firmly by this doctrine in its simplicity and integrity, and will take care that all her Communion Services are consistently adapted to it, whether they are of a plainer or a more ornate kind. If she encourages a devout and regular attend-

[1] It is perhaps not generally known that the Council of Trent desired "the faithful to be present at every Mass to communicate, not only in spiritual feeling, but in sacramental partaking of the Eucharist." Sess. XXII.

"I believe people to be quite wrong who suppose Rome to think hearing Mass to be the better custom, or that it is more than a survival from past necessities, or that Rome would now begin non-communicating attendance, or be otherwise than amused if we should take this, amongst other necessities or exaggerations or abuses, for her deliberate example." Bishop Ridding, *The Church and Commonwealth*: Visitation Charges, p. 76.

ance of all her people at such services she will be drawing them more and more closely to Christ and to one another. And she will be doing more than this. She will be pointing the way towards the effective reunion of all Christian people on the basis of a right use of that Holy Ordinance which was intended to be the bond of fellowship between the disciples of Christ of whatever race and condition, and she will be commending the religion of Christ to the world at large by such a manifestation of Christian unity.

ADDITIONAL NOTE—A

The Word "Mass"

The word Mass is, of course, not Primitive. It is of Latin origin, and the earliest liturgies were in Greek. It is admitted by Roman Catholic authorities that Greek was employed at Rome in the celebration of the Sacrament "by the first successors of St. Peter." In fact the name is not found in any author of the first three centuries. It is agreed that it was derived from the term *missa*, or dismissal of the people, which was used at ordinary assemblies when the business was finished, and was taken over by the Church in the same sense. So Isidore of Seville writes (A.D. 610)—"'Missa' in the time of the sacrifice is when the catechumens are sent out at the cry of the Levite: '*If any catechumen has remained let him go out.*'" The word in course of time came to denote not the dismissal but the business itself, or, in the Church, the service. At first in the Church it was used for services in general, not exclusively the Communion Service, and also for festivals, as *Missa Sancti Andrea*, or St. Andrew's Day. We may compare this with our terms "Christmas," "Michaelmas," etc. Later on in the Roman Church, when the liturgy came to be called the Mass, the word Eucharist was often used as most appropriate to the Sacrament itself as distinguished from the form of the service; and in the catechism of the Council of Trent it is taught that the Sacrament is called the Eucharist because "this very name best agrees with those acts which were done by Christ the Lord in instituting the mystery." There is then no warrant in the actual practice of the Church of Rome for the term *Missa* or "Mass" to be applied, to the exclusion of others, to

the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord. It may be added that, as long as the Church of Rome says her liturgy in Latin, it is proper for her to employ a Latin name to denote that service.

It may well be asked, however, "Why should we apply a Latin name to a service said in English—above all when the Latin is confessedly the most meaningless of all the terms which have been applied to this Sacrament?" Moreover, though the word Mass in itself is a meaningless term, it is to the English mind suggestive of the unreformed mediaeval and the modern Roman doctrine of the Sacrament; and that is the great objection to its revival in the English Church. If a word is wanted to denote the continuity of our teaching with that which has come down to us from primitive times—and with what was good and true in the mediaeval doctrine apart from later accretions—we had better fall back on some truly Catholic word like Communion or Eucharist, which was in use from the beginning and is still in use in both East and West.

The late Bishop Stubbs, of Chester and Oxford, was no mean authority on ecclesiastical history and doctrine, and some vigorous words of his may be quoted here:—"I would beg the clergy to abstain from using the word Mass for the service of celebrating the Holy Sacrament.

"The word Mass signifies that form of celebration which is proper to the Roman and unreformed Church of the West. . . . The service of our own Church contains all that is necessary for the complete celebration, but in form and ritual it is not the same as the Roman.

"The wanton misuse of the name in applying it to our order of Holy Communion is very strongly to be condemned. The Reformers in the first Prayer Book retained the word, but when they realised the state of the case they gave it up. Even if the 'Mass' were identical with the Order of Administration of the Lord's

Supper, the use of the name would be offensive—but, as certainly it is not, it is false, and suggestive of more falsehood and more insincerity. Of the silliness of this I prefer not to speak. On this point I would peremptorily insist : and would forbid the employment of the term absolutely, were I not apprehensive that those who are so foolish as to use it would not be wise enough to obey my injunction." [1]

It may be remarked here that the words " Communion " and " Eucharist " denote different aspects of the same service. They cannot rightly be used to denote two different kinds of service. The fashion has been adopted recently in some quarters of giving the name Communion to an early morning service and reserving the title Eucharist for a choral service celebrated later in the day at which the worshippers are not supposed to communicate, though some may have communicated earlier. Such a distinction is without warrant. The Communion is a Eucharist, and the Eucharist must be a Communion, if it is the service which Christ instituted. The only passages in the New Testament which speak of the Holy Communion as a memorial or as an act of thanksgiving for the sacrifice of the death of Christ expressly associate that use of the Sacrament with the act of communion. " Take this, and divide it among yourselves. . . . This is My body which is given for you : this do in remembrance of Me " (St. Luke xxii. 17-19). " This cup is the new covenant in My blood : this do, *as oft as ye drink it*, in remembrance of Me. For *as often as ye eat* this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come " (1 Cor. xi. 25-26). Accordingly we find no sanction in the practice of the first few centuries for the dissociation of the act of thanksgiving or of pleading from the act of Communion. Such a thing as " non-

[1] *Visitation Charges*, pp. 325-27.

communicating attendance " occurred only " as a penal privation inflicted on a certain class of penitents or as a popular abuse rebuked by authority " (Dr. F. J. A. Hort).

As regards the language of the service, the same words of thanksgiving are used whether the service is said or sung, and such words do not become Eucharistic only when they are sung. This, of course, does not raise the question whether the Holy Communion or Eucharist should or should not be choral. The rubrics authorise either alternative. The Church of England recognises differences of taste and preference in these matters. Some can realise the unseen most easily at a quiet " said " service. To others music is helpful. Some again can enjoy and benefit by either a plain or a choral service at different times. We have no " commandment of the Lord " touching these matters. Whatever is done should be done for edification, and that edifies most which helps people most to worship in spirit and in truth, for " the Father seeketh such to worship Him."

ADDITIONAL NOTE—B

The Word "Catholic"

The formula of Catholicity, as we have seen in the text, is *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, what has been held "always, everywhere, and by all." The significance of the formula is explained clearly and fully in the notable treatise of St. Vincentius of Lerins, the *Commonitorium*. It is shown there how great is the authority attaching to the so-called "Catholic Faith" in that it has been so widely accepted from the beginning. The Church was originally called Catholic because "it extends throughout the world from one end of the earth unto the other," and because it taught the whole faith exactly as it had been handed down, as distinguished from the heresies which were "partial, scattered, and localised." We have noticed how our Anglican Reformers clung to the word Catholic in its proper sense, applying it to both the Faith and the Church. There is a party in the Church of England at the present time, however, who desire to distinguish themselves by the name of Catholic and yet use the word in a peculiar sense to which it is difficult to apply any definite meaning at all. So far as one can judge, what is Catholic would seem to them to be what is mediaeval or Roman, and the implication would be that whatever was accepted by the Church of England when it was in communion with Rome, or whatever is taught by the Church of Rome now, apart perhaps from the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope, is right and true. Apparently it is assumed that, as the Church is a divine institution, everything which at any time found acceptance in the Church must be regarded as something divine. As Dr. Mozley has put it, "Whatever is, is

right. The fact of certain ideas getting established becomes itself a proof of their truth." [1]

Now development in the Church there must have been from the first. Development is an evidence of vigorous life. The grain of mustard seed of which our Lord speaks in His parable [2] reveals its vitality by its power of growth. But change is not development. There may be degeneration as well as development. Or there may be growth, and there may be extraneous accretions on that growth, like the mistletoe on the oak. St. Vincentius had this in mind. He allows development, but only within the clearly defined limits of the pregnant phrase, *profectus, non permutatio.* Progress there may be, but not change. The developed teaching must bear the same relation to that from which it sprang that the man does to the boy, the tree to the seed. The test of true development therefore is, as Bishop Gore has said, "*reversion to type* : the continual recurrence to the original pattern, the continual appeal to antiquity and Scripture." [3] Our religion is the Christian religion. Whatever is taught as Christian must therefore be in exact accordance with the teaching and practice of Christ.

The fact of the prevalence of a specific set of opinions and practices at a particular period in the Church's history is no proof that it was the effect of the directing power of the Spirit of God as being specially dominant over the minds and consciences of men at such a period. It may be explained as having arisen from a recrudescence of superstition, which was the more likely to be the case if there was a comparative absence of general enlightenment at that time. Our present-day studies in Anthropology tend to impress upon us how deeply ingrained in human nature are certain characteristics of our ancestors, who for

[1] *The Theory of Development*, p. 118. [2] St. Matt. xiii. 31.
[3] *The Test of Theological and Ecclesiastical Development* (Church Historical Society).

thousands of years were addicted to magic and animism and various forms of idolatry. The history of Israel shows how grievously these characteristics asserted themselves even among a people who were peculiarly under the Divine care and guidance. Again and again the "chosen people" lapsed to the polytheistic and idolatrous beliefs and practices of the nations that were round about them. So it is scarcely surprising—it is a thing that might almost have been expected—that there should be similar lapses in the Christian Church.

It is significant that these corruptions of, or alien excrescences on, Scriptural and Primitive Christianity should have arisen for the most part among the less-instructed, and should have been first discountenanced, then tolerated, and finally sanctioned by those in authority. There is no disputing the popularity in past days in England of these reactionary cults and practices ; and, indeed, it may be said that in ancient Israel the worship of Baal, while it was in vogue, was always more popular than the worship of Jehovah. The popularity of a certain set of religious opinions and practices in certain quarters is no proof of their soundness. It may simply show that they adapt themselves peculiarly well to some inherited weaknesses of human nature. If it is argued that such opinions and practices might be tolerated because they are apparently helpful to a certain type of minds and meet their religious needs, that is precisely the argument that is used by opponents of Foreign Missions for leaving the heathen in their blindness.[1] And, after all, it is one thing to leave people in their inherited ignorance and another thing to lead them back into benighted ways. It may be shown, moreover, as it has been in these pages, that erroneous and superstitious opinions ought never to be connived at if only for this reason, that, even when held in association

[1] It is the argument that was used by Symmachus in his petition to the Christian Emperor Theodosius for the repeal of the edict against paganism.

with higher beliefs, they tend inevitably to undermine or nullify those beliefs.

The root-cause of superstition in the far past was the mental immaturity of primitive man, his ignorance of the facts of nature and life, and his inability to reason correctly about what he did understand. The general trend of modern culture, of course, is away from fanciful speculation, inaccurate scholarship, and unsound argument. But as long as we have among us immature minds undisciplined by such culture, there is always the possibility of a revival of superstition on a fairly extensive scale.[1]

It is also to be remembered that there persists in human nature a strong tendency towards the materialisation of worship, in recoil from the difficulty of the spiritual worship of One Who is pure Spirit. There are urgent inclinations also in us all towards parade and self-assertion, which, so complex are our human motives, can associate themselves even with a pronounced asceticism. Some of the corruptions that arose in the Middle Ages would seem to have arisen from these sources.

There is again to be noted the desire strongly felt by many for some sort of infallibility in religious doctrine, some guidance that they may surely rest upon in the formation of their religious opinions and decisions. There are even hard-headed, independent, argumentative men to be met with who are willing to abnegate the use of their own Divinely-given power of judgement in favour of an external authority of whose credentials they are all too easily persuaded. Hence the curious readiness with which the talismanic idea of Catholicity is snatched at, even though the

[1] To show the persistence of superstitious tendencies even among the better-educated classes, allusion may be made here to an article on "Superstitious Belief and Practice among College Students" in the *American Journal of Psychology*, p. 83 (1919), where it is stated that of a large group examined 53 per cent entertained some superstition. The article is quoted in *The Origin of Man and of His Superstitions*, by Carveth Read, p. 115.

term is used to denote what is really "an unauthorised and individualistic eclecticism." Hence the more logical though fundamentally un-Christian resort to a supposed infallible Vicar of Christ.

There is a Latin prayer, in regular use by the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England when they meet for Convocation, which exactly expresses what we need to ask for in view of the lessons of the past and the dangers of the present. In English the prayer runs as follows: "Seeing that we all, according to the rule of our holy Reformation, have deservedly and seriously repudiated the errors, corruptions, and superstitions which formerly walked abroad in this land, and the papal tyranny, grant us firmly and with constancy to hold the Apostolic and truly Catholic faith, and to serve Thee fitly and fearlessly with a pure worship."

The Test of Catholicity

As a sequel to the above it may be of interest to apply the test of Catholicity to one or two usages or tenets, in addition to those mentioned elsewhere, which are advocated as Catholic regardless of whether or not they are exactly permitted or enjoined in the Church of England. Nothing, as we have seen, can properly be called Catholic which has not been held "always, everywhere, and by all." It may be admitted, however, that a certain weight of authority attaches to a belief or custom that has been widely held; but, of course, such authority is lost or greatly impaired if the belief or custom has been condemned by a large part of Christendom as inconsistent with the teaching of Christ.

The *Seven Sacraments* were not so enumerated till the twelfth century. The five extra so-called Sacraments are not counted by the Church of England as "Sacraments of the Gospel, because they have not

the like nature with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God" (Article XXV.).[1] They are described in the Article as having "grown partly from the *corrupt* following of the Apostles, partly as states of life allowed in the Scriptures." Private confession, according to Dr. Swete, had no Apostolic precedent, and "when it came into use it was employed only when there was some doubt whether the sin was such as to call for public penitence." Dr. Swete remarks further that it has "become not uncommon among us to speak of this form (of private confession and absolution) as 'Sacramental,' and to regard it as having a validity which does not attach to the general or congregational absolutions. But (1) if a sacrament is 'an outward and visible sign ordained by Christ Himself,' no absolution can be in the stricter sense sacramental, since it has no such visible sign. And (2) there is no good reason for attributing to personal absolution a value which does not belong to one which is congregational."[2] Private confession was not made compulsory in the mediaeval Church till the year 1215. The rule was abrogated by the Catholic Church in this country in the sixteenth century, as not being Scriptural or Primitive.

The *Wafer* as used at Holy Communion is not Catholic. Dr. Fortescue, a Roman Catholic, says, "An appeal to antiquity does not encourage the use of unleavened bread at the Eucharist. All the earlier writers, in East and West, speak of the bread as the ordinary kind, which then, as now, was leavened." The wafer has never been in use in the Eastern Church.

Genuflections during the recital of the Institution, according to the same authority, "did not make their appearance in the Roman Missal until 1570."

[1] The Sacraments of the Gospel are the only ordinances which are "generally necessary to salvation" (Church Catechism).

[2] *The Forgiveness of Sins*, pp. 170-72.

"The elevation of the Sacrament was first formally adopted into the Canon Law in 1217, and was expressly connected with the adoration of the Host."[1]

The *Eucharistic* or *Mass Vestments*, so called, are not Catholic. The chasuble, amice, and maniple were unknown as ecclesiastical vestments before the seventh century. At the first the clergy in Church wore the ordinary dress of men, but preferably white. "Some writers of the third century, like Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, exhibited a repulsion to colours produced by dyeing as unnatural and unspiritual. The earliest rules that we possess dealing with the subject, in the Egyptian Church at any rate, prescribe white (as opposed to colours) as the dress of the clergy."[2] White is the liturgical colour of the Bible. The priests of the older dispensation were clad only in white, and the High Priest at his highest function on the Day of Atonement put on the "holy linen" vestments before entering the Holy of Holies. The bridal dress of the Church in the Apocalypse is of fine linen, "for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the Saints" (Rev. xix. 8). On the other hand, the Great Harlot appears in purple and scarlet (Rev. xvii. 4). And the Fathers of the third century referred to the contrast as a persuasive against the love of dress. Since the Reformation the coloured vestments have been generally disused in the Church of England. If the Ornaments Rubric refers to the directions in the First Book of Edward VI., it has not been acted upon till recently, and, even so, it makes no mention of amice or maniple.[3] The disuse of

[1] Sir Robert Phillimore: judgement quoted in G. J. Talbot's *Modern Decisions on Ritual*, p. 146.

"A minister must not kneel or bow before the elements during the Prayer of Consecration, or elevate them above his head during administration." Chancellor P. V. Smith, *The Legal Position of the Clergy*, p. 90. See also Talbot, p. 121.

[2] Report of the Sub-Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on *The Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers*, 1908, p. 38.

[3] See the Report on *The Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers*, p. 109.

elaborate vestments in the Church of England, as in other parts of Christendom, has been due not only to their not having Primitive sanction, but also to their being apparently out of accord with New Testament precedent and with Christ's teaching about personal lowliness. Even if they were generally revived there would always be an objection to them on that ground in many minds.

The term *Lord's Table* or *Holy Table* has more claim to Catholicity than *Altar*. It is unquestionably Scriptural, and was in general use from the first. It has been continuously in use in the Russian Church, the name "altar" being given to what in the Roman Church is known as the "sanctuary," but not applied to the Holy Table, so called. The Holy Table may properly be styled an altar in a certain sense, as on it we offer our alms and oblations. It is not strictly correct, however, to speak of "God's Altar." "An altar may be thought of as God's Table, but not conversely, a table as God's Altar."[1] It is God that gives the Sacramental food, not man. It is man that offers the alms and oblations, not God.

The ancient use was for there to be but one Holy Table or Altar in each church, and, according to some authors, but one altar in a whole city. It has been the custom of the Greek Churches to have but one Holy Table.[2]

It is a legal pronouncement that the same usage for the Church of England is clearly contemplated in the Rubric and the 82nd canon.

The use of *Holy Water* is not Catholic. We do not hear of it for several centuries after Christ. It was common among the pagans, and is spoken of by Ovid and Virgil. "So many superstitions had become connected with the use of Holy Water that it was discontinued at the Reformation" (Dean Hook).

[1] Except as dedicated to God like other articles of Church furniture.
[2] See Bingham, *Antiquities*, Book VIII. ch. vi. 16, 17.

It has been pronounced illegal in the Church of England.[1]

The *Worshipping and Adoration of Images* is not a proper development from anything taught or sanctioned by Christ or His Apostles. On the contrary, it is plainly "repugnant to the Word of God" (Article XXII.). In the early days of the Church nothing more distinctively marked off Christianity from paganism than that Christian people were wont to pray to God direct, with a clear apprehension of His omnipresence and of His accessibility at all times and in all places.

The following notable passage forms part of Origen's defence of Christianity against the strictures of the pagan Celsus: "What reasonable man can refrain from smiling when he sees that one who has learned from philosophy such profound and noble sentiments about God or the gods turns straightway to images and offers them his prayers, or imagines that by gazing upon these material things he can ascend from the visible symbol to that which is spiritual and immaterial? But a Christian, even of the common people, is assured that every place forms part of the universe, and that the whole universe is God's temple. In whatever part of the world he is, he prays; but he rises above the universe, 'shutting the eyes of sense, and raising upwards the eyes of the soul.' And he stops not at the vault of heaven; but passing in thought beyond the heavens, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, and having thus, as it were, gone beyond the visible universe, he offers prayers to God."[2]

It is contended by some that the use of symbol and image after the pagan method and the localisation of worship are permissible and even advisable in Christian circles in the interests of simple people. Such a contention is undermined by the experience

[1] See *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 1906.
[2] *Against Celsus*, Book VII. ch. 44.

of the Church in the first three or four centuries. Of course, symbolism is legitimate and may be useful if it is in full accordance with the teaching of Christ, if it is not excessive, and if it does not tend to the placing of a disproportionate emphasis on what is symbolised, so that the attention is distracted from other aspects of truth. It is to be remembered, however, that our Lord treated the men and women with whom He came in contact as though they were one and all capable, under the guidance of the Spirit, of assimilating pure spiritual truth without adventitious aids, and most certainly without adulteration and make-believe. It is very significant that His most advanced and profound utterance about the nature of God and the way in which He is to be approached in worship was addressed to one who was badly instructed in religion and had been leading an immoral life. It was to the Samaritan woman that He said, "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. God is a Spirit ; and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth."

V

THE CULTUS OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN

BY

THE VENERABLE JOHN H. THORPE, B.D.

ARCHDEACON OF MACCLESFIELD; VICAR OF ST. GEORGE'S, STOCKPORT

SYNOPSIS

Object of the following. To examine the place assigned to St. Mary the Virgin in thought and devotional literature, and the ground for it.

The inquiry must mainly regard Roman Catholic doctrine and practice, because they furnish the fullest examples. But the inquiry has now a wider scope in face of recent developments elsewhere.

The inquiry is not made in any mere spirit of controversy, but rather to set forth the grounds on which those rely who cannot worship or pray to the Virgin.

A distinction must be drawn between honouring the Virgin and regarding her in the lights furnished by the illustrations quoted.

The purely Protestant attitude a reaction. The Church of England has guarded against both extremes.

In order to appreciate the case to be examined it is necessary to give examples of the extent and extravagance to which the cult of the Virgin has been carried in Roman Catholic teaching.

1. Extracts from the Roman Missal and Breviary, showing—
   (*a*) Prayers offered to the Almighty in her name for her merits, through her mediation, advocacy, and intercession.
   (*b*) Prayers to herself, beseeching her to employ her good offices of intercession with the Eternal Father, and with her Son, in behalf of her petitioners.
   (*c*) Prayers to her directly for her protection from all evils, spiritual and bodily; for her guidance and aid, and for the influences of her grace.
   (*d*) The ascription of divine praises to her, in acknowledgement of her attributes and acts of power, wisdom, goodness, and mercy, and of her exalted state above all spirits of life and glory in heaven; and for her share in the redemption of the world, and the benefits conferred on the individual worshippers.
2. Some brief extracts from R.C. devotional writers of authority showing the steadily increasing exaggerations of the official language already quoted, the whole constituting an eloquent and startling warning.

The Place of the B.V.M. in Holy Scripture

The Old Testament gives no hint of any such association with the Messiah either in prophecy or in type. The nature of the Godhead there revealed allows no such place to a creature as is assigned to the B.V.M.

The New Testament—

The angelic salutation.

The Magnificat.

The infancy of Our Lord.

These give no ground for the cult.

Examination of the chief passages in the Gospels bearing on our Lord's "attitude" towards her.

St. Matthew xii. 46.

St. Luke xi. 27.

St. John ii. 3.

St. John xix. 2. The special significance of this.

Examination of the Acts and the Epistles.

Acts i. 14.

Galatians iv. 4.

1 Tim. ii. 15.

Silence of St. John and St. Peter, especially where we would expect her to be mentioned, very striking.

General—

Our Lord's teaching about Himself and *about prayer* wholly inconsistent with the claims now made for the B.V.M.

She is not a prominent person in His Ministry, and not in the "inner circle." Not present at the Transfiguration, the institution of the Holy Communion, the Resurrection, or the Ascension.

Examination of the phrase "Mother of God." It has no bearing on this controversy.

Comparison of her character with Christ's and to His detriment unavoidable.

The general duty of asking the prayers of our fellow-Christians has no bearing on this subject.

Prayers to the Virgin demand and imply in her Omniscience and Omnipotence.

No ground to think the Virgin anything more than a creature and subject therefore to all the limitations of a creature.

Illustrations from the N.T. of the Virgin's limitations in knowledge. No reason from Scripture or reason to think that death has made any such change in her nature or condition such as is assumed by those who pray to her.

Inventions and fables.

(1) Distinctions in worship.

(2) The Assumption.

(3) The Holy House of Loretto.

(4) The Immaculate Conception.

V

THE CULTUS OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN

Regarding Christendom to-day as a whole we observe three degrees of estimation in which the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Lord, is held. A large number of Protestant Christians may be said to ignore her in their devotions and thoughts, if indeed they do not regard any mention of her with suspicion and dislike. Perhaps it is possible to account for this by the law of reaction. Undoubtedly some Christians have attributed to her offices, titles, and powers which appear to these at least to go far beyond the warranty of Holy Scripture, primitive practice, or sound reason. Thus, because some have given extravagant honours to the Virgin, others give her none at all. In contrast to these the Church of England has in her Liturgy recognised, without apology or hesitation, "the peculiar eminence and unparalleled privilege" which belong to her. The Church of England directs the Virgin's hymn—the Magnificat—to be sung daily throughout the year at Evensong. Two days in the year—the Purification and the Annunciation—are set apart with special Collects, Epistles, and Gospels to recall the minds of Church-people to the Virgin. This honour is greater than that given to any of the Holy Apostles—even the greatest. On Christmas Day she cannot be absent from the thoughts of all who rejoice with

intelligence over the miracle of the Incarnation. The Church of England cannot be charged with forgetting the place of honour which belongs to the Blessed Virgin, nor—which is no less important in view of what follows—can she be charged with going beyond that which has been revealed, or forgetting the nature of God Himself, or the honour and office of our Divine Lord in the work of our salvation.

It is now, however, a matter of common knowledge that the place thus assigned by the Church of England to the Blessed Virgin does not satisfy a section of her members. These, attaching a very high value to an increased realisation of the Communion of Saints, and pressing the scripturally inculcated practice of the duty and value of asking for the prayers of our fellow-Christians here on earth, have not hesitated to extend such requests to the saints departed, of whom the Blessed Virgin is regarded as the highest in honour and power. So far as they are clergy it would appear to be rather unfortunate that they have not waited for some authority for the teaching and practices they have resorted to with such zeal and persistency. In this respect the Church from which they have received their mission, and to whose corporate judgement they, as her accredited teachers, are bound (as they have promised) to submit, has, in the XXIInd Article, spoken in such terms as appear to lay those who have solemnly assented to them under a very serious weight of moral responsibility (which " the man in the street " would probably call " common honesty ") in introducing on their own personal initiative alone such teaching as is now becoming a somewhat startling feature in our modern Church life. The late learned Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury, in his booklet *The Invocation of Saints and the XXIInd Article* (S.P.C.K.), has examined this so thoroughly that I content myself with referring any reader who desires to go further into this matter to his learned and sober arguments,

merely trespassing so far on his ground as to quote his concluding words (p. 62): "I have therefore no hesitation in drawing the conclusion that the Clergy of our Church, having assented to the Article in question, cannot inculcate the use of the 'Ave Maria' in its sixteenth-century form or the 'Ora pro nobis' as used in the Mediaeval Litanies, or introduce any such invocation of Saints into hymns or other forms of worship. They cannot consistently assent to the proposition that such invocation is vain and futile and repugnant to the Word of God and also teach that it is good and useful."

The third degree of estimation in which the Blessed Virgin is held is that of the Church of Rome. It is in startling contrast with that of the Church of England, so startling and uncompromising that the two seem impossible of adjustment or reconciliation. If the teaching and practice of the Church of Rome are sound and true, then those of the Church of England are terribly and perilously wrong, and *vice versa*. The two are as intolerant of each other as a plenum and a vacuum in nature. If what Roman teachers assert of the heavenly position, power, authority, graciousness, and love of the Virgin for sinners be true, then beyond all question we who honour her but refuse to worship her, or to resort to her intercession, have placed ourselves in a position of responsibility, disadvantage, and loss in our earthly conflict from which no theories of "invincible ignorance" or "charitable belief" can possibly extricate us.

It is not possible in the limits of this essay to examine fully the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome to-day in regard to the Virgin, or to estimate the various arguments advanced by Roman controversialists, pledged beforehand to a doctrine which it would be mortal sin in them to doubt, whatever turn argument might take. The object of these pages is not controversy with Roman Catholics, of whom the

writer would speak with great respect in view of their zeal and earnestness and devotion to what they believe to be true, herein setting an example to others who profess to hold a purer faith and yet fall very far short of them in these respects. The end in view is an appeal to Churchmen who have set themselves to introduce by sermons, by hymns, by tracts, by devotional literature, by the erection in churches of statues of the Virgin and Child, and in other ways, an estimation of the Virgin which confessedly goes beyond that of the Prayer Book, and has never been authorised by any tribunal in the Church of England, whether Episcopal or otherwise. I pass by the deeply important question as to how and by whom the doctrine of the Church of England on this or any other subject should be altered, if it requires alteration. That probably is a matter on which the voice of the Episcopate should be heard by the Church. I only remark, as I pass on, that the very worst way of altering the doctrine of any Church, or body, is by the method of emotional innovation and individual self-pleasing, backed up by passionate assertion regardless of sound scholarship, and disposing of inconvenient reasoning by merely ignoring it.

There can be no doubt that the storehouse from which these innovations are drawn are Roman Catholic teaching and practice. For the purpose of this paper it is therefore necessary that some general review of that teaching and practice should be made. For the cultus of the Virgin in the Church of Rome to-day supplies an object-lesson as to what small and uncontrolled beginnings may grow to in process of time, and as such it may well give pause for thought and consideration, as to where they are in danger of going, to those earnest and well-meaning people who are engaged in introducing the cult into the Church of England. The case of the Church of Rome furnishes to such an education and a warning. As an education it supplies much food for thought on the doctrine of development,

its pitfalls and dangers. But as a warning it seems to me to be a trumpet-call to all who love truth for its own sake to stir themselves. "*Respice finem*" may be out of fashion just now, but neglected cautions have a way of revenging themselves in theology as well as in other things. Now the history of the development of the cultus of the Virgin from very small beginnings furnishes a warning specially needed at the present day on account of the serious ignorance of Holy Scripture prevalent in the Church of England. Partly arising from the general neglect of the private study of Holy Scripture, partly from the non-observance of public worship, and partly from the absence of serious religious teaching in schools, there is a prevailing ignorance of Holy Scripture which specially exposes our people to-day to the seductions of superstition. "If the Church be forgetful of the supreme claims of Holy Scripture, she soon becomes a prey to superstitions and follies which fatally discredit her message to mankind."[1] It is notorious that the cultus of the Virgin grew apace in the Western Church in the ignorant Middle Ages when the Holy Scriptures, except for such short passages as were read in public worship in the Liturgy, were practically unknown to the mass of the clergy and laity. We cannot ignore the fact that the chief cause of the change at the Reformation, in the view of the Church of England with regard to the invocation and worship of the Blessed Virgin, was the publication of the Scriptures in English and their general study. To-day, in lands nominally Christian, where the Bible is not read, the cultus of the Virgin flourishes ; where it is read and known, the cultus does not prevail. Illustration would be superfluous. Does not the decay of Bible reading and knowledge in England impose on all clergy and teachers some obligations of scrupulous care in regard to innovation ? And what innovation

[1] Liddon, *Advent Sermons*.

is more dangerous than this, if history is to be allowed to speak ?

Further, the Church of England to-day is suffering notoriously from the lack of discipline. How a proper measure of discipline is to be restored is one of our most difficult and perplexing problems. But one thing appears certain : it cannot be restored unless the spirit of respect for sound learning and obedience to lawful authority, even when imperfect, is inculcated and cultivated all round. Unfortunately, we have (I suppose they have always existed and will always) a class of persons in the Church of England who need to be reminded that religious feeling must be subordinate to the truth of the alleged facts or doctrines by which it is excited. Religious emotions aroused by doctrines that conflict with the clear teaching of Christ and His Apostles cannot be acceptable to the God of truth. Churches filled, if they are filled, by teachings and appeals to emotion, which if not grossly false are yet on the verge of error, and look that way, deserve the control, if not censure, of authority. Now the fact that, in spite of the iron discipline and unquestioning obedience which prevails within the Roman Catholic Church, the Roman authorities have been unable to check or control the extravagances into which the cultus of the Virgin has run (so that it lies like a millstone round the neck of that Church, the chief difficulty and stumbling-block in the way of converts), ought to be a warning to those who are toying with this cultus in the Church of England. The place that the emotional feelings towards the Virgin now occupies in the minds of devout Romanists ought not to be lost sight of. For to deny the existence of God does not call out so much indignant and aggrieved opposition from Romanists as to dispute or deny any of the extravagant honours or powers claimed for the Blessed Virgin by them. A text of Scripture, or an argument against the cultus, is met with surprised and

wounded feeling, to be resented, not considered; to be regarded merely as a virulent and gratuitously offensive insult to the Mother of God and to the hearer's most cherished and sacred beliefs. To have reached this state of mind is to have travelled a long way indeed from that spirit which "proves all things and holds fast that which is good" (1 Thess. v. 21). It is to place emotion grounded on assumption in the throne of reason and the Divine Revelation.

Examples from Roman Catholic Devotions

In order to understand, even in some small measure, the extremes to which the cultus of the Virgin has advanced in the Roman Communion, it is necessary to give a few examples which any reader can verify and add to by his own study. They can only be few because of the limitations of this essay; but a few are enough, for they furnish one of the saddest examples of the truth of Tertullian's words, "Truth is uniform, but it is the very nature of error to be continually assuming new shapes." [1]

In examining Roman Catholic devotional literature it must be pointed out that it does not all stand on the same level of authority. First in point of authority comes the Roman Missal or Communion Office. Next to this is held in the greatest veneration the Breviary, a form of prayer and instruction combined, consisting of psalms, lessons, hymns, prayers, anthems, versicles, etc., arranged in an established order separated into different hours of the day. The value which the Church of Rome sets on the Breviary may be seen from the strictness with which she demands the perusal of it. Whoever enjoys any ecclesiastical revenue, all persons of both sexes who have professed in any of the regular orders, all sub-deacons, deacons, and priests are bound to repeat, either in public or private, the

[1] *On Prescription.*

whole service of the day. The omission of any one of the eight portions of which that service consists is declared to be a mortal sin. The person guilty of such an omission loses all legal right to clerical emoluments due for the day, or days, wherein he neglected that duty.

Next in importance come the works of canonised doctors and saints. After them, devotional books in wide circulation and exercising the greatest influence in shaping the thoughts of members of that Communion, but for which the authorities have given no direct sanction. In these the grossest extravagances are to be met with, and although the authorities may deny official responsibility for them, yet they cannot escape moral responsibility for that which they allow without condemnation, especially in view of the ignorant persons into whose hands such books are placed without one word of warning. Last, but by no means least, since that which appeals to the eye does so with a special force, comes the teaching of Roman art, paintings, and statuary to be seen in their churches, especially on the Continent.

It is true that in the prescribed services of the Missal and Breviary we do not find the same startling expressions of Divine Worship as offer themselves elsewhere ; but we do see plainly in them the same principles which are expanded and developed by other hands. Whatever be the excesses into which some votaries of the cultus have run, yet their unequivocal ascription of divine homage to the Virgin may be justified by an appeal to the authorised ritual of the Church of Rome. And in all these the constant and incessant resource to the advocacy of the Virgin cannot but suggest want of confidence in the sole mediation of our Lord and a strong doubt in His willingness to accept all who come to Him in spite of His own gracious promises. In fact the direct tendency is to make the Almighty an object of fear

and the Virgin Mary an object of love ; to invest Him who is the Father of Mercy and God of all comfort with unapproachable majesty and awe and with the terrors of eternal justice ; and then in direct contrast to array St. Mary with mercy and benignity and compassionate tenderness and omnipotence in her love.

In approaching the following selections it is important that the reader should bear in mind the common assertion of Romanists that they only pray to the Virgin to ask for her intercession with her Son, and never as if she had any power or merit of her own to grant their petitions ; still less as offering her any worship other than that of respect and honour.

The Missal

The *Confiteor* is part of the Communion Service, or Mass, shown in the ordinary of the "Mass for the Laity,"[1] and it reads as follows : "I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you Father (confessor) that I have sinned in thought, etc. Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael, etc., to pray to our Lord for me."

In the ordinary of the Mass after the Lavabo the priest says : "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to thee in memory of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ and *in honour of the* blessed Mary ever Virgin, of blessed John Baptist, etc. ; that it may be available *to their honour* and our Salvation, and that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us, etc."

In the Canon (Commemoration of the Living) : "Communicating with *and honouring* in the first place

[1] Dublin, Duffy, 1847.

the memory of our glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ ; as also of the blessed Apostles, etc., through whose merits and prayer grant, etc."

In the Missal published in English for the use of the Laity[1] the Collect for the Votive Mass of B.V. Mary of Mercy (September 24) runs : "O God, who by the most glorious Mother of thy Son was pleased to appoint a new order in thy Church for delivering the faithful out of the hands of infidels ; grant, we beseech thee, that we may also be delivered from the slavery of the devil *by her merits and prayers*, whom we devotedly honour, etc." On the Octave of Easter in the Secret, at the Mass, the intercession of the Virgin and the propitiation of Christ are represented as joint concurrent and apparently separate causes of our peace and blessedness. "By thy propitiation, O Lord, and by the intercession of the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, may this offering be profitable to us for our perpetual and present prosperity and peace."

Dr. Littledale has pointed out that "the indulgenced Votive Mass of the Holy Trinity is entirely taken up with acts of praise and thanksgiving for the graces, gifts, and privileges bestowed on the Virgin, and almost every prayer in this section is of the same kind. The most fervent petition of all by far is addressed to the B.V.M. herself, beginning thus : 'I acknowledge thee and I venerate thee, Most Holy Virgin, Queen of Heaven, Lady and Mistress of the Universe, as daughter of the Eternal Father, Mother of His well-beloved Son and most loving spouse of the Holy Spirit. Kneeling at the feet of thy Great Majesty, with all humility I pray thee, through that divine charity wherewith thou wast so bounteously enriched on thine assumption into Heaven, to vouchsafe me favour and pity, placing me under thy most safe and

[1] Ed. 1836, p. 527 ; ed. 1847, p. 325.

faithful protection, and receiving me into the number of those happy and highly-favoured servants of thine whose names thou dost carry graven upon thy virgin heart.' In fact the Virgin is constantly made the principal idea and subject of thought and devotion in the Mass. Special altars of Mary are erected, hundreds of priests belong to orders, such as the Marist Fathers, peculiarly vowed to her service, votive gifts are incessantly made to her, the Mass itself is celebrated again and again in her honour, and her Litany is usually sung before the Sacrament in the rite of Benediction."[1]

The Breviary

The Breviary is usually printed in four volumes, one for each season of the year. The following prayer is printed at the beginning of each of the four parts (Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter), to be said after the office for the day. Prefixed to it is the following: "To those who devoutly recite the following prayer after the office Pope Leo X. gave indulgence to the defects and faults in performing the offices, arising from human frailty; and it is said on bended knees." Then follows the prayer:

"To the Holy and undivided Trinity, the humanity of our Crucified Lord Jesus Christ, the prolific Virginity of the most blessed and glorious Ever Virgin Mary, and the entire body of all Saints, be everlasting praise, honour, virtue and glory, from every creature, and to us the remission of all sins, through infinite ages of ages. Amen."

V. Blessed are the bowels of the Virgin Mary which carried the Son of the Eternal Father.

R. And blessed be the breasts which gave suck to the Lord Christ. "Our Father. Hail Mary!"

In the calendar the following festivals are devoted

[1] *Plain Reasons*, p. 58 *sqq*.

to the praise of the Virgin : Purification, February 2 ; Annunciation, March 25 ; Visitation, July 2 ; Assumption, August 15 ; Nativity, September 8 ; Presentation, November 21 ; Immaculate Conception, December 8.

Space forbids my giving extracts from the Breviary for all these festivals, but the following may suffice : Among the most favourite addresses to the Virgin is the hymn "Ave Maris Stella," which reads in English—"Hail, Star of the Sea and kind Mother of God, and Ever Virgin ! happy Gate of Heaven ! taking that 'Hail' from the mouth of Gabriel ; do thou establish us in peace, changing the name of Eve. Do thou for the accused loose their bonds, for the blind bear forth a light, drive away our evils, demand for us all good things. Show that thou art a Mother. Let Him who endured for us to be thy Son through thee receive our prayers. O Excellent Virgin, meek among all, do thou make us meek and chaste, freed from fault, beholding Jesus, we may always rejoice together. Praise be to God the Father, glory to Christ Most High, and to the Holy Ghost ; one honour to the Three. Amen." [1]

Extract from a sermon of S. Bernard Abbot : "Grievously, indeed, most dearly beloved, did one man and one woman injure us ; but thanks be to God not the less *by One man and one woman are all things restored* ; and that not without increase (usury) of Grace." Here the Virgin is represented as our joint Saviour with Christ, as Eve is regarded as the joint source, with Adam, of our original fall.[2]

These are only a few extracts from the most authoritative books of devotion in the Roman Communion. Before I pass on, two considerations seem naturally to present themselves. (1) Were it really intended that the invocation of the Virgin should be

[1] Commune Sanctorum. In Festis B.V.M. per annum. See also Vern. clvii, Aest. cxxxvi, cxlv, clvi.

[2] Aest. cliv.

exclusively confined to requests that she would pray for her petitioners, why should language be addressed to her which in its plain, obvious, grammatical, and common-sense interpretation can only be regarded as direct prayers to her for benefits at her own disposal? (2) If the Church of Rome had intended that her members who invoke the Virgin for her aid should ask her to grant temporal and spiritual benefits, dispensable at her own will and by her own authority and power, what words could she have prescribed for their use which would convey that intention more explicitly and unequivocably than the very words adopted, sanctioned, and prescribed?

The true nature and import of the prescribed prayers of the Church of Rome to the Virgin Mary can be seen by the simple fact that the same words without any change of meaning or substance form fit prayers to be offered by sinners to the Redeemer Himself.

Devotional Literature by Doctors, etc.

Passing from the authorised and public (and private) Office Books of the Church of Rome, the devotional works of doctors, prelates, and canonised persons next claim our attention. It is quite impossible to treat this part of the subject in anything like an adequate manner, for these voluminous writings can only be described as a veritable morass of devotional rhapsody and ignorance. Those who have the opportunity of studying them will gain some idea of the excesses into which even celebrated teachers may run when once they allow the smallest inroad to be made upon the integrity of God's worship, and an illustration of the helplessness of Church authorities to stem the flood of superstition and error when once allowed to obtain a place in the devotions of the masses of ignorant and emotional Christians.

Bonaventura (a.d. 1221 to a.d. 1274).—He was

of the Order of St. Francis, was offered the Archbishopric of York by Clement IV. (1265), which he refused, became afterwards a cardinal, and was canonised 1482. He is called the "Seraphic Doctor." In his "Psalter of the Virgin" he takes each of the one hundred and fifty psalms and so changes the commencement of each as to address them all, not to the Lord God Almighty, but to the Virgin, interspersing in some much of his own composition and then adding the *Gloria Patri* to each. Thus in Psalm xxx., instead of "In thee, O Lord, have I trusted, let me not be confounded for ever, etc." (as in the Vulgate), the Psalter of the Virgin substitutes these words: "In thee, O Lady, have I trusted, let me not be confounded for ever; in thy Grace take me, etc."

In Psalm xxxv. v. 2, "Incline thou the countenance of God upon us; compel Him to have Mercy upon Sinners (*Coge illum peccatoribus misereri*)." The last sentence of the Psalms is "Let everything that hath breath praise our Lady."

Bonaventura treated the *Te Deum* in the same way. "We praise thee, Mother of God; we acknowledge thee Mary the Virgin." "All the earth doth worship the Spouse of the Eternal Father." He also distorted the Athanasian Creed in the same manner. "Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold firm the faith concerning the Virgin Mary . . . whom at length He took up (*assumpsit*) Himself into heaven; and she sitteth at the right hand of her Son, not ceasing to pray to her Son for us." To this I will add only the translation of one prayer more from the works of this canonised saint, of whom Pope Sixtus IV. declared, "He so wrote on divine subjects that the Holy Spirit seems to have spoken in him." "Therefore, O Empress and our most benign Lady, by the right of a Mother command thy most beloved Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ, that He vouchsafe to

raise our minds from the love of earthly things to heavenly desires, who liveth and reigneth." [1]

Bernardinus de Bustis was the author of "The Office of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin," used on December 8. He composed various works in honour of the Virgin, to one of which he gave the title "Mariale." He writes: "Of so great authority in the heavenly palace is that Empress that, omitting all intermediate Saints, we may appeal to her from every grievance. . . . In the fourth place he may appeal to her, if any one feels himself aggrieved by the Justice of God." Again, "Since the Virgin Mary is Mother of God (and God is her Son, and every Son is naturally inferior to his Mother and subject to her, and the Mother is preferred above and is superior to her Son), it follows that the Blessed Virgin is herself superior to God, and God Himself is her subject by reason of the humanity derived from her." [2]

Alphonso Liguori [3] died in 1787, and the Congregation of Rites at Rome pronounced his works "uncensurable." Pope Pius VII. in 1803 approved of their sentence, and he was canonised by Pope Gregory XVI. in 1839. In his works we find the same sentiments as those already cited from Bonaventura, Bernardinus, and others. Liguori is regarded by Roman Catholics as an authority of no ordinary value. His work called *The Glories of Mary* is recommended in Ireland as a manual for all the faithful.

From Liguori's *Glories of Mary*: "Dispensatrix of the Divine Grace, you save whom you please; to you, then, I commit myself, that the enemy may not destroy me (p. 100). . . . St. Anselm, to increase our confidence in Mary, assures us that our prayers will often be more speedily heard, in invoking her name, than in calling on that of Jesus Christ (p. 96). . . . We, Holy Virgin, hope for grace and salvation

[1] *Works*, vol. vi. p. 406. [2] Part IX. Sermon II. p. 605.
[3] See Breviary, August 2, and Dr. Wiseman's *Lives of the Saints*.

from you ; and since you need but say the word, Ah ! do so ; you shall be heard, and we shall be saved."

"We read in the Chronicles of St. Francis that brother Leo once saw in a vision two ladders, one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ ; and the other white, at the top of which presided his blessed Mother. He observed that many who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps, fell down ; and, on trying again, were equally unsuccessful ; so that they never attained the summit ; but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, they soon gained the top, the Blessed Virgin having held forth her hands to help them." "Mary so loved the world, as to give her only begotten Son" (p. 476).

The foregoing will, I hope, be sufficient to enable readers who are not acquainted with the subject to judge for themselves what accredited teachers in the Roman Church have put forth on this subject. They are no more than specimens which could be multiplied to an almost unlimited extent. They are amply reflected in the popular devotions of Roman Catholics. The Rosary, for instance, is made up of one hundred and sixty-six beads, on which are recited one creed, fifteen "Our Fathers," and a hundred and fifty "Hail Marys." The Angelus, which in Roman Catholic countries is recited thrice daily, contains three "Hail Marys" in each recitation, so that she is addressed at least nine times a day in prayer, whereas no similar devotion to the Father or Christ is recommended. The month of May every year is now specially dedicated to the Virgin and termed the Month of Mary, every day of which is expected to be chiefly occupied with devotions in her honour. Special altars are put up in Roman Catholic countries during May in her honour. Images of her, decked with flowers, etc., obscure the view of the high altar. A fervour and eagerness of devotion are then displayed, never seen on festivals of

Our Lord. Some, indeed, have gone so far as to assert that in the Eucharist she is bodily co-present with Christ and there fed upon by the communicants.

Titles given to Saint Mary the Virgin

The titles given to the Virgin Mary in Roman Catholic devotional literature, in Papal Bulls, and other official documents are worthy of attention, as showing in a very convincing and direct manner the estimation in which she is held. Here is a selection of them: "Holy Mother of God," "Most Blessed and Most Glorious," "Our Lady of Heaven," "Our Lady of X" ("Paris," "Lourdes," "Mount Carmel," and a thousand other places), "Queen of Heaven," "Queen of Purgatory," "Lady and Mistress of the Universe," "Happy Gate of Heaven," "Spouse of the Eternal," "Mother of Grace," "Mother of Mercy," "Queen of Angels, Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles," "Sweet Mary," "Source of the Fountain of Grace," "Refuge of Sinners," "Comfort of the Afflicted," "Advocate of all Christians," "Star of the Sea," "Dispensatrix of Divine Grace." It would be, perhaps, sufficient to dismiss all this with Bishop Bull's remark, "We have no instance of such attributes given to the Blessed Virgin in the Holy Scriptures, and they are too big for any mere creature;"[1] but two or three call for some short notice.

The title "Queen of Purgatory" implies a double assumption. (1) That there is such a place, or state, as the Purgatory known to Romanist doctrine; and (2) that the fable of the Virgin Mary visiting Purgatory every Saturday for the deliverance of souls from it is true, as set out in "a brief account of indulgences, etc., conferred on the order, etc., of the Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel."[2] This fable is guaranteed as true by the Bulls of five Popes—John XXII., Alexander V.,

[1] Sermons IV. p. 104, ed. 1846.

[2] Dublin, 1826, p. 13.

Clement VII., Pius V., and Gregory XVI. It is from this that the title "Queen of Purgatory" is derived. Indeed, Saturday has come to be regarded as the Virgin Mary's Day, as Sunday is the Lord's Day, a curious and distressing illustration of which is given by Archbishop Usher in his *Answer to a Jesuit* in a quotation from Bernadin de Bust, to which the reader is referred (p. 423 and note).

The title "Queen of Heaven" has a special interest for those who have time and learning to investigate historically the point raised by the late Rev. M. H. Seymour in his *Evenings with the Romanists*, p. 219, that the real origin of prayers to and worship of the saints is to be sought in the Dii Minores of classical mythology, involving *inter alia* transference of the titles of Juno to Mary as the female divinity of Christianity.

The title "Star of the Sea" is undoubtedly founded on a false derivation of the word Mary, as if it were a Latin name and derived from *mare*, the sea. It is, of course, a Hebrew name, which appears in three forms in the Bible—Miriam in the Old Testament, and Mariamne (Herod's wife), or Mary in the New Testament. It is derived from a word meaning in Hebrew "bitter." All the poetical rhapsody written on the idea of "the star" is therefore founded on sheer misunderstanding.

As to the title "Blessed Virgin," while it is quite innocent in itself, it should be pointed out that it is an entire misunderstanding both of the angelic salutation and of the words of the Virgin herself ("Blessed art thou among women," and "All nations shall call me Blessed") to conclude that the word "blessed" has been divinely conferred on the Virgin as a title. The words mean no more than that she would be universally esteemed happy. The same Greek word is used in the Epistle of St. James (v. 11) of those who endure affliction patiently.

The common title of "Our Lady," by itself,[1] or in its many varieties as "Our Lady of So-and-so—Paris, Loretto, Lourdes, Mount Carmel, etc.," demands perhaps a closer attention than it has received. When it is joined to a place there is no doubt that the implication is that the Virgin has some kind of multiplicity of personality resembling the Omnipresence of God. And this is shown by the actual rivalries for precedence which prevail in Roman Catholic countries between the various "Our Ladies." In Brittany, for instance, rivalries and parties are attached to certain "Our Ladies." Thus "Madame Marie de Bon Secours," let me remark, is not just like any other "Madame Marie." "We know that in Brittany the Blessed Virgin of each parish has her official place in the hierarchy of Saints, her distinctive rank, and right of precedence among Virgins of other parishes." The same writer, indeed, observed a local belief that there is even such a relationship between the different Virgins as that of cousinship.[2] All this goes on with the knowledge and without the opposition of the clergy. The absurdity of the implications needs no demonstration. We have, however, a nearer concern with this title "Our Lady." In recent years a number of persons in the Church of England have desired to restore the use of the term "Catholic," and as members of the Church of England to assert their right to it. With such persons I, for one at least, have the fullest sympathy. For, rightly understood, Catholic means orthodox, primitive, and true. But sometimes the methods adopted by such well-meaning people are not the soundest and wisest. One rule they feel bound to follow when referring to the Virgin Mary. They invariably and markedly allude to her as "Our Lady." This is the practice not of unlearned people only but of persons of all ranks. Their motive

[1] Although see Prayer Book, "Lessons Proper for Holy Days."

[2] *The Bretons at Home*, by Frances M. Gostling (Methuen, London), pp. 54, 63.

to restore the Virgin Mary to her rightful place in the thoughts of others by speaking of her in terms of special respect is altogether laudable ; but their method seems to require review and examination. We know how much importance, both in the Old and in the New Testament, is attached to the meaning and use of "the name" of God. It is a phrase of tremendous import, conveying the meaning of God in His revealed character to us.

"And the Lord (Jehovah) proclaimed the name of the Lord (Jehovah). . . . The Lord (Elohim), merciful and gracious, etc." (Exodus xxxiv. 5, 6). "By what power, or by what name, have ye done this? Then Peter . . . said unto them . . . by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth" (Acts iv. 10).

Now we find in the New Testament the pronoun "Our" used with a marked reserve and purpose towards God. In the first place, it is restricted throughout to the first two Persons of the Blessed Trinity. "Our Father" (Matt. vi. 9) ; and "Our Saviour" ; "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts xx. 21) ; "The Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour" (Titus i. 4) ; "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc." (1 Cor. xvi. 23, etc.). I cannot recall one passage in the New Testament where this possessive pronoun is prefixed to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, although He is in such close relation with the Church and with each individual believer. Is there no reason for this restriction? I think there is a very profound one. Is it not this—that the Father and the Son are in a certain covenanted relationship to us? The Father gave the Son, and the Son came. The Father and the Son sent the Holy Ghost. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." "Whom the Father will send in my name" (St. John xiv. 16, 26). Now with this before us what ground or authority or reason have we for

speaking of the Blessed Virgin as "Our Lady"? What covenanted relationship does she stand in towards us? None whatever, I answer without hesitation. She is in no sense the author of our salvation, any more than any other agent who was the human instrument of carrying out God's purposes through and in Our Lord Jesus Christ. She is not outside or above "Our." She is herself within all that is covered by "Our Father" and "Our Saviour," and is saved as we are by the sacrifice of her Son, Our Lord and hers as well. She, like we, was included in the promise of the Comforter. A Romanist, to whom the Holy Scriptures are as a foreign country, may be pardoned for his use of "Our Lady," but for those who have the Bible placed freely in their hands it is surely inexcusable habitually to use this title. It is never given to the Virgin Mary in the New Testament or in primitive authentic writings. "Our Father," "Our Lord," "Our Lady" have only to be placed thus in juxtaposition to arouse an instructed Christian judgement and conscience to the absolute incongruity of the last.

So far as the title "Our Lady" is explained as expressing a universal spiritual Motherhood on the part of the Blessed Virgin, it is at once refuted by pointing out that this attribute is expressly ascribed to the mystical Church. "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal. iv. 26). The modern Romanist interpretation of Rev. xii. (the woman clothed with the sun, etc.), as a prediction of the Glory of the Virgin, is by the ancient commentators, with absolute unanimity, understood of the Church, as Dr. Salmon has pointed out. In an ancient writer "The Virgin Mother" would certainly mean the Church.[1]

I ought not to omit the subject of Roman Catholic

[1] Dr. Salmon, *Infallibility*, p. 161, note quoting the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. *H.E.* 1).

Art, whether in sculpture or in painting. At this time of day it is not necessary to demonstrate what a powerful educational value all appeals to the eye possess. Our illustrated papers, our diagrams and illustrations in all educational and scientific works, the very dead walls and hoardings of the land all testify to this. In the Church of Rome the Holy Scriptures are theoretically not forbidden, but it is certain that the mass of the people do not read them and are not encouraged or exhorted to do so. Even the Roman Catholic clergy are singularly unacquainted with them and certainly not diligent students of them. To the poor and ignorant what they see in their churches must inevitably and powerfully influence their conceptions and beliefs. Now how is Christ usually presented in Roman Catholic churches? As a dying man on the Cross, or as a babe in the arms of His Mother. The Crucifix and the Madonna and Child are forms of art which are never absent from such churches.

In all churches of this kind the Stations of the Cross are displayed on the walls, sometimes indeed in very poor and mean pictures but often in really beautiful paintings or bas-reliefs. They represent Our Lord in His Passion with moving appeal, and they usually end with some incident in the Crucifixion. The inevitable association of thought with Christ is of death and weakness—a dead man or a babe; that with the Virgin is life and vigour. This will explain why so much of the devotion of the people and most of their prayers are addressed to the pictures and images of Mary, or are performed before them.

In religious pictures the practice is to represent the Virgin as the principal figure, with the Child Jesus as a sort of appendage to her to show that the figure was intended for her. Just as the figure of St. Catherine is recognised amongst others by a wheel, and that of St. Margaret by a tower, so in pictures of Mary the Babe appears to be nothing else than a mere accessory

to identify her. A very large number of Roman Catholic pictures represent the Virgin Mary in heaven, enthroned above the clouds and encircled by angels and cherubs. Even there she is represented with the infant Jesus in her arms, as if Our Lord were still an infant even in heaven !

In Italy, where we should expect, on account of its proximity to Rome, to find the purest and highest form of Christianity, if the claims of the Roman Bishop are true, pictures may be seen in churches in which the Virgin appears crowned as Queen of Heaven, seated on the same throne with Jesus crowned as King of Heaven. They are the God-Man and the God-Woman crowned alike.

In the Baptistry of Parma there is a representation of the Trinity. At the top of the triangle is the Father. At the two angles of the base are the Son and the Mother ; the two arms of the Father, resting on the heads of the Son and Virgin, form the legs of the triangle, while the arms of the Son, extended to the head of Mary, form the base.[1]

The well-known fables about the picture of the Virgin in the Chapel under St. Peter's, Rome, shedding blood when struck with a stone, of that at Arezzo which shed tears on hearing profane language, and of another of the Virgin and Child at Lucca of which it is affirmed, when some one flung a stone at the face of the Child, the Virgin transferred the Child to the other arm and thus saved it from injury, and many others of the same kind are locally firmly believed.[2] These instances are not only deplorable in themselves, but a disgrace to the clergy of the Roman Church, who have not denounced such errors and done away with the pictures themselves. There can be no doubt that Roman Catholic sculpture and pictures reflect the erroneous teaching of the Church of Rome about the

[1] Seymour, *Evenings with the Romanists*, p. 255.
[2] Seymour, *ibid.*

Virgin, and minister very powerfully to its acceptance within that Communion.

I think I have given the reader sufficient by way of illustration to enable him to appreciate to what a pitch the cultus of the Virgin has advanced in Roman Catholic thought and devotion. It is to be hoped he will investigate the matter at fuller length himself, in which case I believe he will see that this cultus has advanced so far as almost to substitute a new religion for Scriptural and primitive Christianity, so that in purely Roman Catholic countries (such as Italy) it may be said the religion of the Virgin Mary has supplanted the religion of Jesus Christ. At any rate the very last words the Roman Ritual puts into the mouth of the dying are : " Mary, Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, do thou protect me from the foe and receive me in the hour of death." Though, indeed, these words are preceded by Our Lord's last words on the Cross and those of St. Stephen, yet the last and surest appeal is to Mary, not to her Son. " A Buonconte de Montefeltro had but to end a life of crime with the name of Mary, and ' per una lagrimetta ' he was out of the grasp of devils who claimed him." [1]

What saith the Scripture ?

The position assigned to the Virgin Mary in Roman Catholic devotional thought and practice is so lofty and influential as to exalt her to a place little, if at all, inferior to that of one of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Christianity being a Divine revelation contained in the Holy Scriptures, it is natural to turn to them to find the grounds on which this position given to the Blessed Virgin are based and justified. If the Virgin is really exalted in herself so far beyond all other creatures, it will be strange indeed if clear and un-

[1] Dr. Mason, quoting Dante, *Purgatorio*, v. 100, in *Purgatory, etc., Three Lectures*, p. 56.

mistakable evidence to that effect is not easily found there. But if the whole cultus is untrue, then the absence of support for it in Holy Scripture is very simply accounted for.

The reader may probably expect examination of the Bible for this purpose to be confined to the New Testament. It is true that it is there that we must mainly seek for light on the subject. But we cannot pass by the Old Testament altogether, even though we consider certain allusions in the Song of Songs[1] and Ecclus. xxiv. in the Apocrypha, appropriated by Roman devotional writers to the Virgin, as unworthy of serious notice. There is one passage at least to which attention is due. In the Roman Catholic English Translation of the Bible (known as the Douay) Genesis iii. 15 is thus rendered, " I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed ; she (Latin *ipsa*) shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait (Latin *insidiaberis*) for her heel." On this passage Bishop Harold Browne has written in the Speaker's Commentary : " It is well known that Roman Catholic Divines have attributed the Victory to the Virgin Mary, misled by the rendering of some MSS. of the Latin *ipsa*, she. The original Hebrew is perfectly unequivocal ; for, though the pronoun might be so pointed as to signify either *he* or *she*, yet the verb is (according to the Hebrew idiom) masculine. Moreover the LXX. has *seed* in the neuter, but the pronoun referring to it, *he*, in the masculine, which would naturally refer it to some individual son of the woman. The Syriac version also has a masculine pronoun."

The sacrificial system of the Jewish Church and the whole volume of prophecy in the Old Testament have been, with practically universal consent, interpreted by Christian scholars as pointing to Christ, as fulfilled in Him, and in Him alone. In the amplest

[1] Several Epistles in the Breviary are supplied from this, although no writer treats the B.V.M. as the Bride till about A.D. 1150.

and widest sense "Christ is the end of the Law" (Rom. x. 4). When Christ Himself interpreted both Law and Prophets on the road to Emmaus, "He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (St. Luke xxiv. 27). Where in sacrifice, type, or prophecy is there anything that points to such a person as the Virgin Mary of Roman Catholic devotion? There is no room or place for her there: He fills all. This is indeed unaccountable if she is who and what she is claimed to be in the belief of millions of Christians. But it is simple enough if primitive Christianity, and the Church of England following it, has assigned her the place of honour and respect which is her due, no more than her due and no less.

When we come to the New Testament the only texts that appear to have any possible bearing on the subject are the following eight:

(1) St. Matthew xii. 46-50: "While he yet talked to the people, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." What trace is there here of any intercessional efficacy with her Son on the part of the Virgin? On the contrary, those who receive His teaching and do God's will are as near as any earthly relation, including His Mother. The relationship in the flesh is put at once apparently on a lower level than that in the Spirit. Indeed, it is impossible to divest Our Lord's words of a slightly reproving sense. He does not single her out for special notice, or distinguish her as in a different

category from His brethren. If Roman teaching about her be true, our Lord's action and words ought to have been—and would have been—very different.

(2) St. Mark iii. 31-35 is the same incident.

(3) St. Luke i. 26-57. The Annunciation : " And the angel came in unto her and said, Hail ! thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee ; blessed art thou among women ! " There is nothing in the words of the angel which justifies prayer or worship to the Virgin. There are, however, two words in it which exercise an extraordinary influence over the minds of Romanists and others devoted to the cultus of the Virgin and which require notice. The first is " *Hail.*" This word contains not a shred of Divine honour or worship. It was the ordinary salute of the time. It was addressed by Our Lord to the Disciples after His Resurrection (St. Matt. xxviii. 9), when He certainly did not pray to them or worship them. It was spoken on coming into the presence of a person as a courteous salutation. It is absurd to use it as a prayer or to address it to a person who is not present.

(4) " *Thou that art highly favoured*," or, as the Douay reads, " full of grace," translating the Latin " *gratia plena.*" These words, which are more correctly rendered in the Authorised than in the Douay version, confer nothing to warrant Roman doctrine about the Virgin. " Full of grace " does appear in the original (πλήρης χάριτος) once, but then it is applied to Our Lord Himself and to Him alone (St. John i. 14). The same verb used by the angel in his salutation to Mary is used in Ephesians i. 6 of all believers, " Wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved." There can be little doubt, however, that the words " full of grace " are commonly understood by Roman Catholics as meaning that the Virgin is in herself a treasury of spiritual strength and help, which she can dispense at will. Of course nothing could be farther from the true meaning of the words.

(5) "*The Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women.*" Our Lord Himself uses the same word "blessed" of those on the right hand in the judgement (St. Matt. xxv. 34). And the whole phrase "blessed," etc., is used of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite (Judges v. 24), no more justifying prayers to, or worship of, Jael than of Mary.

(6) St. Luke ii. 41-50. The visit to Jerusalem. I deal with this later on.

(7) St. Luke ii. 51. "And he went down with them and came to Nazareth and was subject unto them." This passage makes as much for St. Joseph's authority as for that of the Blessed Virgin. The cultus of Joseph needs examination (but not here), yet it is not claimed for him that he shares in the present (assumed) authority of the Virgin. And Our Lord decided St. Joseph's position as in a lower rank than that of John the Baptist (St. Matt. xi. 11).

(8) St. Luke xi. 27. "'*And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.*'" Our Lord does not deny the honour placed on His Mother as such, but beautifully turns it to its true side—that given her long before in the words of Elisabeth, "Blessed is she that believed" (Luke i. 45). This honour all believers may share with her. But it in no way confers on her the Office and Glory claimed on her behalf.

(9) St. John ii. 1-5. The marriage at Cana. Here, answering her implied request to Him to help their hosts, He says, "*Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come.*" Without addressing her as Mother He gently refuses to let her dictate His action (St. Irenaeus speaks of Christ having "checked the unseasonable haste of His Mother of Cana").[1]

[1] *Adv. Haer.* III. xvi.

His reply called out what has been aptly called "The Gospel according to St. Mary"—"Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it."

(10) The next and perhaps the most important and illuminating passage of all is St. John xix. 25-27. "*Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home*" (Douay, "*took her to his own*"). Again, as at Cana, He addresses her as "Woman." Is it not remarkable that even in the hour of death He did not call her Mother? Was not this of a piece with his words in St. Matt. xii. 46? Was there not a lesson intended as on former occasions —that He is equally near to all, that all are equally near to Him, and He no nearer to His Mother than to you and me? As St. Augustine says, "*Now that which she brought forth was dying.*" The relationship in the flesh between Him and her was about to close. Hence He commended her to another son who would care for and protect her. Common sense suggests that she who needed the care and protection of another was not likely to be able to help sinners to heaven, or to act as Mediator on their behalf. Consistently with this scene the Virgin practically disappears from the activities of the Church, being mentioned only once (Acts i. 14), and there as joining in prayer and supplication with other disciples, without the smallest note of precedence, authority, or special spiritual character or office.

Reviewing the whole relationship between Our Lord and the Blessed Virgin Mary as set out in the Gospels during His actual public ministry, it is impossible not to observe and be struck by the restrained and guarded character of His language and attitude

towards her. In his ten recorded appearances after His Resurrection not once did He specially appear to her, nor is she even named as being present on any of the occasions. She is never put forward prominently during His ministry. She was not present at the Transfiguration or at the institution of the Eucharist (though nothing could be more suitable and consistent than His Mother's presence on that occasion if the Roman Doctrine of the Eucharist were true) or at the Ascension. Never once does He call her "Mother." Never is she called "Mother of God" by any New Testament writer. Jesus commended the faith of the centurion and of others, the love of Mary Magdalene, the excellences of John the Baptist. But He who was perfect in all His ways and "without sin" never uttered the smallest encomium on His Mother or expressed any obligation to her. These are arresting and highly significant facts which cannot be devoid of purpose. Not one particle of evidence can be produced from the Gospels that the Virgin had any special influence with Our Lord arising from her maternal relationship. On the contrary, we see grave reasons for believing that He willed His relationship to her in the flesh to fall into the background. The Gospels rather suggest—especially that passage in St. John xix.—that her relationship was not intended to be perpetual, certainly not in any such sense as to exalt her in Heaven to a unique position of authority and dignity higher than any created being, and, as Queen of Heaven, almost within the Godhead itself. After the close of the Gospels she is mentioned by name but once (Acts i. 14). She is never named in the Epistles, although they contain constant allusions to the duty of prayer and intercessory prayer. In one passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (iv. 4), "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law," reference to her would be more naturally made in terms of

greater dignity and honour *if the claims of Roman devotion were true*. But if those claims go beyond the sober truth, then the Apostle's reference to her as "woman" is adequate. Perhaps, having regard to the special claims made by the Church of Rome for St. Peter, the absence of any reference to the Virgin in his Epistles is even more noteworthy. It is doubtful indeed if there is any direct reference in them to the Incarnation. He certainly makes no mention of the Virgin Mary, and this is the more remarkable when in exhorting wives on their behaviour he instances Sarah as an example for them. Again in another passage, when exhorting all women to humility, and especially younger women, one wonders why the example of the Virgin Mary, so appropriate in connection with that virtue, is not cited (1 Peter iii. 5). Was it because St. Peter had learned the restraint and wisdom of His Master? There is no mention of her in the Book of the Revelation. This is remarkable considering the subject of the Book, especially in the closing chapters, and the place in Heaven now attributed to the Virgin. There is no account in the New Testament of her death and burial. The authorised tradition of the Roman Church is that she lived sixty-three years on earth. Her death must thus have fallen well within the time covered by the Acts of the Apostles, which come down to A.D. 63; but no mention is made there of so great an event with such consequences. We shall see later on how imagination has sought to gratify curiosity in this respect.

Inferential Arguments

This is perhaps the best point at which to consider two inferential arguments from Holy Scripture commonly advanced in support of the dignity and powerful advocacy of the Virgin. The first is derived from

the fact of her being the "Mother of God" and from none having so powerful an influence with a son as a mother. As for the title "Mother of God" I have already pointed out that it is never used in Holy Scripture. The title comes down to us associated with the Nestorian Controversy and was expressed in the Greek word *Theotokos*. This term was a pithy compound "which set forth the dignity of the Virgin Mother: but also principally with a serious doctrinal purpose in order to secure the truth that Jesus Christ, the Virgin's Son, was God, that although His Godhead was incapable of 'birth' yet He who had from eternity been God from God . . . had in becoming man taken flesh from Mary, who was thus the mother according to His Manhood of One who was personally and indefeasibly God, but who had entered into a human sphere of being. . . . At the same time the title (*Theotokos*) was open to misconstruction; it needed some theological insight to do it justice: it made perception of the true issue difficult: it stimulated that 'cultus' which has now in the Roman Church attained proportions so portentous. . . . It would have been far better if a phrase which directly concentrated attention on her Son and not on herself, could have been made the Catholic symbol in the controversy. The title 'Mother of God' does not reproduce the exact purport and aim of the designation (*Theotokos*). 'She whose Son is God' would be a better although a more cumbrous designation: and so Bishop Bull adds the words, 'that is, of Him who is God,' while the first Reformed Liturgy uses the expanded phrase Mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God."[1]

"Though she was the Mother of Him that was God, yet she contributed nothing to Him as God; but He, as such, was and is her God, Lord, Creator, and Saviour: to whom therefore she, together with

[1] Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, vol. ii. pp. 263-64.

us, pays all humble adoration and worship. Nay, she was not His mother as man, in so strict a sense as other women are mothers of their children, for she conceived Him not naturally, but by the help of the Divine Spirit overshadowing her, so that her very conception of Him as man was immediately due to Him as God, and she was eternally bound to praise Him for so wonderful an operation wrought in her. And it is to be observed, that ancient doctors of the Church, when they contested with heretics about the title Theotokos, Mother of God, designed not by that title so much to advance the honour of the blessed Virgin, as to secure the real and inseparable union of the two natures in Christ : and to show that the human nature, which Christ took of the Holy Virgin, never subsisted separately from the divine person of the Son of God." [1] Bossuet, the great Roman Catholic doctor and controversialist, on behalf of himself and the other French bishops assembled in Synod at St. Germains, conveyed to Bishop Bull the unfeigned congratulations of the whole clergy of France for his writings, especially his *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae*, 1694.[2]

Those who depend on this word *Theotokos* as proving that the early Christians held the Virgin in the kind of exalted honour now claimed for her, and not rather as showing their desire to preserve inviolate the doctrine of the union of the perfect Godhead and perfect manhood in Christ, deriving His manhood through her, may be usefully reminded of the language of the Fathers in some analogous cases. The Apostle James, for example, called in Scripture the Lord's brother, was afterwards called Adelphotheos or God's brother—not to exalt him above his fellow-Apostles but to declare the faith of those who so named him,

[1] Bishop Bull, "Twenty Sermons," No. IV., *Works*, Oxford University Press.
[2] See Latin inscription on his tomb given in Nelson's *Life*, p. 406. *Works* as above, 2nd ed.

that the Lord Jesus was very God. It was in like sense and manner that the Virgin was called *Theotokos*.[1]

The words of the Athanasian Creed are surely sufficiently clear and conclusive, "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man, of the substance of His Mother, born in the world." To ground an argument for prayers to the Virgin on the title "Mother of God" is to fail to understand the history and meaning of the title. Christ did not derive His Godhead from the Blessed Virgin.

Another inferential argument advanced in support of prayers to the Virgin Mary is derived from the duty and privilege of intercessory prayer generally. How often St. Paul writes, "Brethren, pray for us." Surely, it is said, if we may ask the prayers of our fellow-creatures on earth we may invoke the prayers of the saints, and of which with more advantage than the Virgin Mary?

Now far be it from me to suggest that the faithful whom we have known and who have loved us while they were here on earth have forgotten us in Paradise, where they now rest. I desire to write with the greatest reserve and caution on that mysterious and difficult subject. I see in it many problems, difficult and indeed insoluble with our present limited knowledge. For instance, I cannot say whether saints whom we have never known here on earth can after death acquire knowledge of us as individuals and so pray for us. In this respect I cannot see that Apostles, Martyrs, and Great Saints, not excepting the Virgin Mary, differ in any way from the humblest in Paradise.

Again, apart from any denial or assertion as to the part memory plays in the case of the blessed dead, I am unable to measure the effect on conscious spirits

[1] See Joan. Damasc. Hom. II. C 18, *In Dormit. Virgin.* vol. ii. p. 881. Le Quien, Paris, 1712.

in Paradise of the law of attention. They are now in a condition not only of assured rest and peace, but in the presence of the wonders and visions of the unseen world. How far their attention is engrossed by this new world or what attention a finite soul in Paradise can give to the interests of this passing world, its joys, sorrows, or struggles, who can guess or know?

Further, it seems to me wholly impossible to reconcile the accepted belief that the Virgin Mary and all the saints departed are at rest with the doctrine that they know what is going on here on earth, are able to hear and pay attention to the prayers of thousands or millions of suppliants, and possess knowledge of the vast mass of human sorrow, suffering, and sin on this earth. The fact that the Virgin and the saints when on earth could not probably understand any request unless conveyed in the language they themselves spoke, raises a most important and pertinent question, "How can they understand petitions now expressed in languages unknown when she and they lived on earth? Or is their knowledge that of the thoughts only of their petitioners, and, if so, who knows this? and how has the information been obtained?"

Without entering into the difficult questions raised by the subject of intercessory prayers, there is certainly one great reason for them which can hardly apply in the case of the blessed dead generally, or of the Virgin Mary in particular. That is their moral and spiritual values for those who engage in them. These are many and obvious. Prayer for others is an exercise in unselfishness, in sympathy, in Christian love. It is an expression of the faith that men are one body and members one of another. It gives play to the affections. It corrects and smooths personal animosities and disagreements, for no man can continue at enmity with one for whom he daily intercedes. For all these

reasons and many others intercessory prayers produce moral reactions in those who offer them, intended by God for our advancement in holiness and part of our spiritual discipline in our probation here on earth. Now we are so imperfectly acquainted with the conditions of the blessed dead, including that of the Virgin Mary, in the interval between death and the Resurrection, that we are wholly unable to assert with good grounds any application to them of this moral side of intercessory prayer, which is beyond doubt one of its great uses and reasons here.

It is also fair to remark that when we seek the prayers of our fellow-Christians here on earth we certainly do not go down on our knees, offering our requests in prayers addressed at the same time to God and in such language as I have already given specimens of. As Archbishop Usher said, "To request the help of the prayers of our fellow-servants is one thing, and to worship them with the service of invocation is another."[1]

There is, however, one crucial difference between requests to our friends on earth to pray for us and prayer offered to the Virgin for her intercession.

We know for certain that our friends on earth can hear our requests. They can assure us that our requests for their prayers have not been in vain. They know, too, the circumstances in which we are placed and can pray with due intention and intelligence, or they can refuse our requests. But in the case of the Virgin Mary we have no such assurance or certainty. On the contrary, we have very serious reasons to conclude that she is beyond the reach of any prayers of ours, however earnest or vehement. And this applies equally to all forms of worship addressed to her. In order to see this let us take an illustration. Five persons in different parts of the world engage in prayer to the Virgin Mary for different

[1] *Answer*, p. 404.

objects at the same hour—one in America, one in England, one in Italy, one in Africa, one in Australia. Now if she is to hear all these she must be omnipresent and omniscient. But omniscience and omnipresence are incommunicable attributes of Deity, which it would be blasphemy to attribute to any creature. If it were established that she could hear the prayer of one of these, who could assure the particular one that he was that person, and on what grounds? But when we realise that possibly millions of persons pray to the Virgin Mary daily, under all possible variety of circumstances and for a range of objects as wide as human interests, we can see that nothing short of these attributes of the Deity I have named, as well as of that of omnipotence to endure such a burden, to prosecute such a labour, to bear such a strain, must be attributed to her. Now what ground have we in Holy Scripture, or in sound reason, for believing that the Blessed Virgin has ceased to be a creature and has been endowed with the attributes of the Almighty or with some of them? None whatever. During the days of her flesh she showed no special gifts of knowledge or power. During her stay in Egypt, hiding from Herod, she had so little knowledge of events elsewhere, even of the greatest interest to her and her Divine Son, that she did not know of the death of Herod, or what course she should pursue thereon, till an angel revealed it, and then not to her direct but in a dream to St. Joseph (St. Matthew ii. 19). Later on, when His parents took Him at twelve years of age to the Passover at Jerusalem, an illuminating incident in this connection took place. Jesus was lost and only found after three days' sorrowful search (St. Luke ii. 48). It is absurd to conclude without some definite and clear evidence putting the matter beyond all doubt, that she who did not know the whereabouts of her Son in Jerusalem, and spent three days in agonized search for Him, can now hear the prayers of

millions all over the earth, and has done so already for hundreds of years. We have absolutely no evidence, reason, or ground for believing that any change has taken place in the essential nature of the Blessed Virgin, or that the mere fact of her death and passage into Paradise (if true—it is an undecided point with Roman theologians whether the Virgin has yet left Purgatory) has endowed her with any of the attributes of Deity. But those who advocate and practise prayers to her are forced by the necessity of the case to give her some such attributes. I believe that an intuitive consciousness of this necessity, following the practice of praying to her, in part explains the wholly extravagant and unscriptural titles given to the Virgin in books of devotion.

So far as prayers to the Virgin are defended on the ground that she is more compassionate, tender, and considerate than our Lord (passing by the many and wholly unjustifiable assumptions involved in her hearing prayers at all), I do not hesitate to brand such an assertion as a slander on the love of Christ. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." He laid down His life for His enemies. He ever liveth to make intercession for all who come to the Father by Him. He said, "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out" (St. John vi. 37). The words of St. Paul ought at least to give pause and warning to all who resort to the Virgin and others as heavenly intercessors: "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5).

Inventions and Fables

A fair and impartial examination of the Holy Scriptures, which are the only inspired sources of information on the subject, leads inevitably to the con-

clusion that they furnish no support for the cultus of the Virgin, and that by no process of fair and sound reasoning from them can worship of her, or prayers to her, be deduced or defended. I think the inventions and fables which have been put forth are a tacit confession that this is so. I proceed briefly to consider four of these.

(1) The Roman doctrine is that, as the Virgin surpasses all Saints and Angels, Cherubim and Seraphim, and all the powers of heaven in authority, purity, and dignity, so a worship ought to be given to her higher than that paid to them. To express this difference a new word has been coined to signify it alone, neither the Greek nor the Latin language supplying one adequate to the purpose. The worship paid to saints and angels is called by the Greek word *dulia*, that is "service"; to the worship paid to the one Supreme God is assigned the name of *latria*, also meaning "service"; but to the worship of the Virgin is appropriated the invented word *hyperdulia*, implying a service above the service called *dulia*. Now this distinction has no ground whatever to rest upon but the will and imagination of those who invented it. Both the words *dulia* and *latria* are used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament (LXX.), and in the original Greek of the New, as equivalent expressions without any such distinction. See Deut. xxviii. 36, 47, 48; 1 Sam. xvii. 9; xii. 24; xxvi. 19; Ezek. xx. 40; and especially 1 Thess. i. 9 in comparison with Heb. ix. 14, where we find the two words *dulia* and *latria*, in the form of verbs, used to signify the true worship of God in a person changed from idolatry. "How ye turned to God from idols to serve (*dulia*) the living and true God." "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve (*latria*) the living God."

In fact the distinctions are false in theory and useless in practice. In the same prayers addressed to God, the Virgin, and saints, who can so nicely balance his thoughts and differentiate his devotions as to give to God, the Virgin, and the saints each their proper proportion of worship—no more and no less? Where in the teaching of Our Lord or His Apostles can such a distinction be found? The only distinction of which worship admits is *civil* and *religious*—civil belonging to man and religious to God alone. "It hath been the constant doctrine of the ancient Church, that all religious worship, whereof prayer by the judgement of all men, as well heathen as Christian, hath been always esteemed to be an especial part, is so properly due unto God alone, that without committing of idolatry it cannot be communicated unto any creature." . . . "For in the Catholic Church it is divinely and singularly delivered, that no creature is to be worshipped by the soul, but He only who is the Creator of all things" (Saint Augustine).[1]

(2) The Festival of the "Assumption of the Virgin Mary" (August 15). The following is the account of it given in the Breviary (*Die* 18 *Aug. inf. Oct. Assumpt. B. Mariae*):

Lesson IV.: "We received from ancient tradition that at the time of the glorious falling asleep of the Blessed Virgin, all the Holy Apostles, who were travelling all over the world for the salvation of the heathen, being elevated on high, in a moment of time met together at Jerusalem. And when they were there, a vision of angels appeared to them, and they heard the psalmody of the celestial powers. And then with divine Glory, She (the Virgin Mary) delivered her soul into the hands of God. But her body, which in some ineffable way conceived God, being brought forth, with angels and Apostles singing hymns, was deposited in a coffin in Gethsemane, in which place

[1] Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 403.

the singing of the angels continued for three whole days." Lesson V.: "After three days, however, the angelic song having ended, the Apostles who were present—for Thomas alone who was absent, came after the third day, and wished to adore the body which had conceived God—opened the tomb; but they could not find the sacred body at all in any direction. When they only discovered the things it had been wrapped up in, and were filled with an ineffable odour, which arose from them, they shut the coffin. Amazed at the miracle of the mystery, this was all they could think, that He who was pleased to take His flesh and to be made man, and to be born of the Virgin Mary, when He was God the Word and the Lord of Glory, and Who, after His birth, kept her virginity intact, He was also pleased to know her immaculate body, preserved from corruption after her departure by translating it, before the common and general Resurrection."

On what authority, we may well ask, does this story, the ground of all the services of the Festival of the Assumption, the greatest of all the Festivals which the Church of Rome celebrates in the Virgin's honour, rest? On none that is worthy of a moment's acceptance. In the first place, the Holy Scriptures are utterly silent as to the time, manner, and fact of the Virgin's death, though no Roman accounts—even manifest forgeries—place her death too late for mention to be made of it in the Acts of the Apostles.

The earliest writer who has asserted the Assumption of the Virgin, body and soul, as it is now held in the Church of Rome, is Gregory of Tours, who died *circa* A.D. 595. His account (according to his Benedictine editor) he drew from a forged work by one who is called the "False Melito," the very work which, just a century before (A.D. 494), the Roman Council, with Pope Gelasius at its head, denounced as false and not to be read by the faithful, styling it "The book called the *Transitus*, that is, the Assumption of the Blessed

Virgin." It was only after the time of Gregory that the Service of the Assumption crept into the Roman Liturgy.

Having regard to an event, if true, so miraculous in its nature, and so important in its consequences, it is inconceivable that there should be a total silence respecting it in Holy Scripture. It is equally inconceivable that, if true, the writers of the first four centuries should never have mentioned it. It is incredible that, if true, the first writer who put forth the account should have lived in the middle of the fifth century or later, or that he could have any certain knowledge of such an event. Why did God not see any loss or inconvenience in leaving the Church so many centuries without this information, if true, and at last leave Christians at the mercy of notorious and palpable forgeries for the information—if true? However, if the whole story is false, as it undoubtedly is, none of these questions arises, and the Assumption of the Virgin Mary has indeed been "happily so called."[1] The fact that the birthday of Napoleon was August 15 greatly helped the popularity of this Festival in France. But how must all this appear in the eyes of Him who is the God of truth? By the Lesson and Gospel appointed in the Missal for the Feast of the Assumption the Church of Rome tacitly owns that it cannot find any foundation or justification for the fable of the Assumption in Holy Scripture. The Lesson is taken from the Apocryphal Book Ecclesiasticus (xxiv. 11, 20), and is clearly a panegyric of Wisdom. The Gospel is St. Luke x. 38—the account of our Lord in the house of Martha and Mary. "Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken from her." The only reason for the selection of this portion of the New Testament for the Gospel would appear to be the occurrence in it of the name Mary.

[1] For further see Tyler, *The Worship of the B.V.M. in the Church of Rome* (S.P.C.K., 1851).

(3) The Holy House of Loretto. This is another fable invented to associate the miraculous with the Virgin Mary, and so prepare the minds of Romanists to accept the extravagances taught about her. The story is this. When Palestine fell into the possession of Mahommedans, and worshippers could no longer visit it, the Virgin Mary's house at Nazareth was carried by the angels across the seas on May 9, 1291, and, after taking three temporary resting-places, finally rested at Loretto, near Macerata, in Italy, in the year 1295. There it attracted many pilgrims, and was by them enriched with abundant gifts. Several Popes pledged their credit to the truth of the story, and rewarded pious visitors with Indulgences. A history of the house has been written by Tursellinus, a Jesuit.[1] But another story locates the Virgin Mary's last days and death as having taken place at Ephesus, under the care of St. John, where her house is shown with equal confidence and lack of serious evidence.[2]

(4) The Immaculate Conception. This Festival is observed by the Roman Church on December 8, in honour of the alleged conception of the Virgin Mary without sin. The doctrine was invented about the middle of the twelfth century, and was for long a subject of acrimonious and bitter dispute between Roman Catholic theologians. At length, in December 1854, Pope Pius IX. issued a Bull declaring that the Virgin Mary was born without sin (see *The Tablet*, January 27, 1855). "We pronounce and define that the doctrine which maintains that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her Conception was . . . preserved free from the stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and is, therefore, to be piously and constantly believed by the faithful. Wherefore, if any should presume to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them

[1] Dr. Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 197.

[2] See *Pauline and other Studies*, by W. M. Ramsay, chapter on "The Worship of the V.M. at Ephesus."

know and understand well, that they have . . . suffered shipwreck concerning the faith, and have forsaken the unity of the Church." [1]

Holy Scripture testifies most clearly to the universal corruption of human nature, and no trace of any exception but One is to be found there. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. iii. 23; v. 12). "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin" (Gal. iii. 22). The words of the Magnificat, the Virgin's own hymn, contradict the dogma. "My soul doth magnify the Lord and my Spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." None but a sinner needs a Saviour. Roman defenders of the dogma, however, trust not to direct testimony of Scripture, but to an inferential argument which turns out to prove too much and so prove nothing at all. "Was not," they inquire, "our Lord Himself without sin? Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? For Him to be sinless from His birth it was necessary that His Mother should be sinless too. Therefore she was sinless." But the awkward thing about this mode of reasoning is that it applies with equal force to the Virgin Mary's own mother and to her mother again, and so back to Eve. Now in the genealogy of our Lord, as recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel, it is a remarkable fact that of all the female ancestresses of our Lord after the flesh only four are mentioned in addition to the Virgin Mary: Thamar, Rahab, Ruth, and "she that had been the wife of Urias" (Bathsheba). Were they immaculate? Is it unreasonable to suggest that in the light of their histories their insertion in this genealogy is an inspired contradiction by anticipation of this false doctrine about the Virgin Mary?

[1] Part of Bull of Pope Pius IX. defining the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.

The witness of the primitive Church is equally clear as Scripture, and not a single writer for more than a thousand years can be cited as having given the least countenance to the Roman view.

Cardinal Bellarmine admits that one single text of Scripture cannot be brought in support of this doctrine. "People cannot expect that we can bring forward an express text of Scripture on this matter or any certain definition of the Church."[1]

Augustine says: "Mary sprang from Adam, died, because of sin."[2]

Melchior Canus, a celebrated canonist of the Church of Rome, writes thus: "The dogma which holds that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin is nowhere delivered in the Scriptures according to their proper sense: nay, the general law which is delivered in them embraces all who were descended from Adam, without any exception. Nor can it be said that this doctrine descended in the Church by Apostolic tradition, for traditions of this kind cannot have come to us through any other persons than by the ancient Bishops and the Holy Authors who succeeded the Apostles. But it is evident that these ancient writers did not receive this doctrine from their predecessors."[3] Again, "All the Saints who have made mention of this question assent with one voice that the B.V.M. was conceived in sin."[4]

St. Bernard condemns both the Feast and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as false, novel, and superstitious.[5] The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary is a daring falsehood, unworthy of the pure and holy woman in whose behalf it has been put forth, and in itself—even if true—raising an idle and useless question. Its only

[1] Bellarmine, *De amiss. Grat. et Stat.* Pec. lib. IV. cap. xv. tom. iv. p. 103. Colon. ed. 1615.
[2] Aug. *Op. Enarr.* in Ps. xxxiv. ser. ii. tom. iv. col. 240. Paris, 1691.
[3] Mel. Canus, *De locis theol.* lib. vii. cap. iii. vol. i. p. 377. Matrili, 1792.
[4] Mel. Canus, as above, vol. i. p. 369.
[5] Ep. 174, tom. i. col. B, 93. Paris, 1839.

purpose is to furnish some show of the miraculous which will prepare those who belong to the Roman Communion to receive and to practise without question those devotional extravagances and superstitions of which I have given a few, comparatively very few, examples. I have refrained from asking the reader's attention to some of the worst excesses to which the cultus of the Virgin has run, mainly on the continent of Europe, where Romanism is not restrained by the presence of other and purer forms of Christianity as it is in England.

The examples I have given are sad enough for any true Christian to read, and I think they are enough for my purpose without even more saddening additions.

But saddest of all is the dishonour done to our Divine Lord and Saviour, both by the misrepresentation of His true character as the loving and ever-available One Mediator between us and God, and by the defrauding Him of His exclusive glory in the hearts and worship of millions of devout and earnest Christians. If sinners believe they are surer of access to God the Father through Christ if they approach Christ through another and not directly, the inevitable consequence will be that for one prayer addressed to Christ Himself there will be ten thousand addressed to this other. We have abundant evidence that this actually takes place amongst those Christians who esteem St. Mary the Virgin in the terms of Roman Catholic doctrine and devotions. But for us who do not accept those terms and who live in the free atmosphere of true Catholic thought, with its constant appeal to the Holy Scriptures, Christ is sufficient, while we honour and reverence her who was indeed "highly favoured."

> Not out of envy or maliciousness
> Do I forbear to crave your special aid.
> I would address
> My vows to thee most gladly, blessed Maid,
> And Mother of my God, in my distress :

But now, alas ! I dare not ; for our King,
Whom we do all jointly adore and praise,
Bids no such thing :
And where His pleasure no injunction lays,
('Tis your own case) ye never move a wing.

GEORGE HERBERT, " To All Angels and Saints."

I conclude this essay with the following quotations from a thinker of peculiar force and acumen—the late Archbishop Whately. Writing on the subject of the Invocation of Saints, he says : " But the real state of the case, doubtless, is that the practice which began gradually in popular superstition, and was fostered and sanctioned by the mingled weakness and corruption of the priesthood, was afterwards supported by a theory too unfounded, and too extravagantly absurd to have ever obtained a general reception, had it not come in aid of a practice already established, and which could be defended on no better grounds. And the same principle will apply to the greater part of the Romish errors ; the cause assigned for each of them will in general be found to be in reality its effect ; the argument by which it is supported to have gained currency from men's partiality for the conclusion." [1] Writing on the dangers of deceit and the supporting of one fraud by another, the Archbishop says : " Let it not be lost sight of, that the fraud by which they sought to support the system—the ' wall daubed with untempered mortar ' with which they thought to buttress up the edifice—has always tended to its decay. Not only did it give rise to a hostile separation among Christian Churches, but, in countries which have continued under the Papal sway, the abhorrence and contempt excited by the detection of a fraudulent system has led the far greater part of the educated classes into secret but total apostasy from Christ. With the indiscriminate rashness which is universally so common, they have con-

[1] *Errors of Romanism*, p. 104.

fusedly blended together in their minds, Christianity, and its corruptions ; and having in so many instances detected fraud with absolute certainty, they think it not worth while to inquire further ; but take for granted, that all the Church teaches is one tissue of imposture and superstition throughout." [1] Let not us of the Church of England miss the benefit of this warning.

[1] *Errors of Romanism*, p. 97.

VI

THE NEW REFORMATION

BY

THE REV. CHARLES E. RAVEN, B.D.

RECTOR OF BLECHINGLEY, CHAPLAIN TO THE KING
LATE FELLOW OF EMMANUEL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
AUTHOR OF
"WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?"; "CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM 1848-1854," ETC.

SYNOPSIS

I. The present crisis : its scope and character.
   (*a*) A century of materialism ending in the enslavement of Life to things.
   (*b*) The revolt of Life strengthened by the war.
   (*c*) This revolt chaotic and ineffective because unguided by religion.
   (*d*) The desire for Life a return to the standards of Jesus.

II. The consequent opportunity of the Church of England.
   (*a*) Her failure due to—
      1. The refusal to put first things first, as seen in
         the idolatry which mistakes means for ends,
         the Judaism which prefers the law to the Gospel,
         the sectionalism which loves controversy and piecemeal reform.
      2. The refusal to scrap antiquated methods in dealing with new problems.
   (*b*) Her hope based upon—
      1. Her past record as Catholic, Evangelical, and Progressive.
      2. The Christianity of the younger generation.
      3. The emergence of a new and representative type of Anglican.

VI

THE NEW REFORMATION

God's judgement of the world is no doubt rightly represented rather as a process than as a single dramatic event. Little by little and line upon line sentence is passed upon us : we act and are judged, or judge ourselves, daily. Yet, although it is a mistake to break up the continuity of life into a series of disconnected episodes, long periods of monotony interrupted by sudden excitement, there are in our own lives and in human history special occasions on which we become unusually aware of responsibility for our decisions, occasions when manifestly a judgement-day has dawned. Most men can look back to several such points in their careers when a crisis long unconsciously prepared has confronted them, revealing to them by their attitude towards it their own true nature and determining the whole scope and quality of their future. And with races and institutions as with individuals, events so insignificant that even in the light of their results the historian can scarcely trace them culminate in drama so intense that none can be blind to its meaning or uninterested in its issue. Few of us would venture to deny that the present generation is in the throes of such a crisis, a crisis unparalleled in the records of humanity, a crisis for which Renaissance and Reformation despite their smaller scale supply the one possible analogy.

The Industrial Revolution which initiated and has

given its name to the present epoch has altered much more than the material environment of our lives. Along with the development of new methods for the exploitation and control of the world's resources and with the haphazard construction of a social order dominated by economic considerations, there has come a profound and radical alteration in every department of human thought and activity. During the first half of last century the progress of discovery and invention, the opening up of the world and the increase in wealth and population, made inevitable the reconstruction of the whole order of human society. The problems of industrialism could not be solved by the application of methods appropriate only to the circumstances of a previous age. Nor could their solution be indefinitely postponed. At first the new learning, developing far more rapidly in the factory than in the study or the council chamber, lost control of the situation, and men occupied themselves rather with the technique of perfecting the means of physical life than with the service and advancement of life itself. Their leaders indeed, by the adoption of a policy of *laissez-faire*, frankly announced their own futility, and relapsed either like Melbourne into the cynicism of despair or like Ricardo into barefaced advocacy of the ethics of the jungle. Individualism dominated the thought of Church and State alike: only in the realm of the physical sciences was any serious contribution made to the enlargement of intellectual and spiritual life.

There followed a period of acute controversy when the scientific movement pushed forward its claims from one field to another and fought a long series of encounters with the champions of tradition and with the armies of the indolent. Bit by bit the right to apply new methods to the study of all subjects and to revise old judgements in the light of fresh knowledge was asserted. Always the opposition was intense: always the struggle was long and bitter: always the

result was the same. It is probably true to say that by the opening of the twentieth century the leaders in every department of human knowledge had made terms with the new learning. So far as abstract thought was concerned the revolution had taken place : in history and sociology, philosophy and theology, the last strongholds of the old world were being reduced. Men trained in the habits and outlook of the time found themselves thinking and speaking in categories wholly strange to the representatives of the previous generation. But in more concrete matters the change was still to make. In politics and religion especially, in the relationship of man to man and of man to God, in the supreme and universal interests of humanity, the majority was and still is unwilling to give way. Reverence for the past and respect for authority, half-conscious acceptance of prejudice and convention, fear of change in spheres where change would be widespread, and if rapid might well be disastrous, could rely for support upon the easy-going, the muddle-headed, and the self-centred, upon the majority of those who had passed their middle life, and upon the influence of those institutions, educational, social, political, and religious, which the middle-aged usually control. No doubt their disappearance was certain. Another generation and resistance would collapse. Gradually and without conscious upheaval the old world would pass into the new. The end was sure : its achievement did not seem remote.

But those who had hailed the opening century as a day of hope wherein patience would reap its reward, and the ideals painfully conceived by the travail of lonely pioneers would grow to their fulfilment, were rudely disillusioned. They had not foreseen the effects of a period of vast material productivity wherein the expansion of machinery and of population had been allowed to go on unchecked by spiritual considerations,

undirected save to materialistic ends, wherein the true purpose of life, the glorifying of God and the service of His Kingdom, had been almost forgotten. Man only forsakes reality and denies God at a price. He had accepted a creed of blood and iron in the nineteenth century : he must be redeemed by blood and tears in the twentieth. In the corporate life of humanity a cancerous growth, neither controlled by the action of vital forces nor subordinate to the eternal needs of the body, had been developing inevitably and unperceived. Disease and bitter pain, war vast in proportion to the magnitude of the ulcer, were the penalty of our neglect of health.

And the effect of war has been to shatter the hope of a peaceful transition from old to new. Its influence upon the mentality of Europe, and indeed of civilisation, has been immense. For partly by the speeding up of reforms like the emancipation of women, partly by demonstrating the futility of existing systems of society, politics, and churchmanship, it has forced us to the conscious knowledge that humanity has lost its way, that the old roads have proved blind alleys, and that we must break out at all costs and rediscover the direction of our march. Great masses of people, mostly unfamiliar even now with the progress of the new learning, mostly unimaginative and in temperament inclined to conservatism, have been aroused by suffering and are setting themselves to the discovery of the causes of their pain, and of measures for its speedy relief. They know that no one person was responsible; they can see that war was no sudden accident or whim, but the outcome of causes deep-seated in the constitution of society ; and in consequence, until they can reach an accurate diagnosis they are prepared to challenge the whole theory and practice, ideals and institutions, of pre-war days, and to search wistfully and eagerly for something to take their place. Wild revolts against traditional morality, tentative or chaotic ex-

periments in social and industrial life, sheer opportunism in national and international government—all these are signs of the times and proofs of their quality.

And in view of the scale and complexity of our problems and the urgency of the need for their solution, it is small wonder that men are bewildered and that their handling of the situation should be largely empirical. For the unrest so characteristic of the industrial life of Europe is only typical of the position in other departments. It is obvious enough, not only to the external observer but to the more thoughtful of the workers, whether employers or employed, that the established system of production and distribution has broken down, that it is at once inadequate to the supply of human need, so that factories and ships are idle while half the world is in want, and has become so mechanical and inhuman as to outrage the personalities of its servants and drive them into a passion of revolt. It is perhaps less obvious that our peril, grave as it is in the sphere of economics, is even more critical in other aspects of life, and probably most so in relationships more elementary even than those of consumer and producer or of master and man, the relationship of sex with sex and of race with race. To readjust our world to the new condition of equality between men and women, and to revise our sex ethics in view of new ideals of marriage and family life, these are tasks which cannot be shirked and are far harder than to construct a better order in industry. And even these are not so perplexing as the problems of racial contacts, where the issues are such as to tax to the full the imagination of the seer and the wisdom of the sage, the knowledge of a legion of experts and the administrative ability of an army of statesmen. Englishmen brought up in pride of insularity, and forced by the logic of facts into a recognition of "the Empire," are now compelled to shape their lives afresh against a background as wide as the world—

a world wherein they carry an unequalled burden and an unequalled responsibility—a world full of menace if they fail.

And if the war has forced the knowledge of these issues upon us, it has also wrought a vast change in the spirit in which they are being met. An illustration, not irrelevant to the main theme of this essay, may forestall the criticism of those who are inclined to regard the past eight years as an interlude leaving little mark upon the mentality of the generation which has borne their brunt. A very prominent ecclesiastic, lecturing recently to an audience of undergraduates on the problem of reunion, based his case for the retention of episcopacy on the argument that for nineteen centuries it had been the accepted form of Church government. Ten years ago such evidence might have been convincing. To-day its effect is precisely the opposite of that intended by the lecturer. His audience knew that the Church had failed: they had been told that episcopacy had been characteristic of its system: therefore it was at least possible that episcopacy was responsible for the failure: in any case it had had an opportunity for nineteen centuries: surely it was time to give something else a trial. To the archbishop long survival was proof of worth; to his hearers it was qualification for the scrap-heap. We are not concerned to criticise the wisdom of either party, but only to mark the significant difference between them.

No one would, of course, be so foolish as to deny that there are many who are still apathetic, many who in all classes of society have made profit out of disaster and will fight for the retention of their gains, many who are terrified and cling desperately to the relics of the past. After the earthquake shocks of the last eight years it is inevitable that the graves of dead superstitions should be opened and that men should be haunted by phantoms and imposed upon by turnip

ghosts. The pathetic belief that we can return to the social order of the Middle Ages ; the overwrought imagination which scares itself into hysteria over the Bolshevist conspiracy against civilisation ; the fantastic credulity which, despairing of this world, consoles itself with spirit-photographs and the vagaries of ectoplasm—these and similar symptoms of neurasthenia must not be allowed to obscure the fact that multitudes of people, and especially of young people, are setting themselves sanely and courageously to the discovery of a clue which shall lead them out of the maze into which mankind has wandered. Nothing is more encouraging in these difficult days than the seriousness and idealism of the men and women at our Universities and Colleges. Nothing sounds a louder challenge to the followers of Jesus Christ than the eagerness with which they are testing the validity of the claims made in His name.

It is indeed obvious that such a time affords an unrivalled opportunity for the Church. Jesus is said to have predicted that in a season of terror and great darkness, when men's hearts were failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth, the Son of Man would be revealed ; and though a literal Second Advent would seem to be far from His meaning, it is plain that in every crisis of history He comes visibly to judgement, and once more offers Himself for the Crown or the Cross. It is a strange thing that within a few years of the discovery by Biblical scholarship of the apocalyptic element in the Gospels, and while many were still treating it as a delusion or a dream, life itself, the prosaic and machine-made life of an industrialised civilisation, should have become suddenly apocalyptic, and that those standards of value which men had scorned as the products of a mere *interims-ethik* should have forced themselves inevitably upon us beneath the thunder of the guns. For, as a multitude of us can

testify, when the world plunged into war the spirit of man recovered the atmosphere and the temper of those far-off days in Palestine, their romance and self-sacrifice, their fellowship and their hope. When humanity found itself in the grip of the monstrous machinery of destruction, when it offered its naked flesh to be rent and racked by steel and poison, it recaptured in agony and an infinite endurance the right to liberty, the lordship of life over things. With body broken and blood outpoured, mankind shattered the tyranny of materialism, and in a grim sacrament of pain, dying to live, gained communion with its God.

That is indeed the chief ground for encouragement; for underlying the revolts and discontents of the time is a profound and radical change in man's outlook upon the purpose and value of existence. The materialistic philosophy which darkened the closing years of the Victorian era has vanished like a bad dream. There can be few cases in history in which a dominant philosophy has collapsed so rapidly. In the eighties of last century materialism seemed to have established itself: when Oxford University bowed the knee to Herbert Spencer, the triumph of a mechanistic interpretation of the universe was complete. In the next decade, when the fruits of that horrid victory were displayed by Oscar Wilde, his popularity sealed the articles of capitulation. Those of us who have been spared the bitterness of those years, and find the record of them scarcely credible, have not yet been sufficiently generous in our homage to the faithful remnant which repudiated the apostasy; for we are chiefly concerned with the present lack of leadership in Church and State which is the consequence of that surrender, and with the scars and mutilations which disfigure so many of the survivors from it. Yet here, as of old in the Arian controversy, the very completeness of the conquest proved the ruin of the conquerors. As the Blasphemy of Sirmium was at once a proclamation of supremacy

and a death-warrant, so now materialism had only to reveal itself in order to be decisively rejected. The instincts and conscience of humanity had been betrayed by a handful of dons : that was hardly noticeable. But when the betrayal made its mark upon literature and society, resentment was rapid and universal : within ten years the ogre which had terrorised Europe was a shapeless and dishonoured corpse. If relics of his rule still survive in the realm of economics, if its renewal seems threatened by certain tendencies of recent psychology, we can at least recognise them for what they are, and guarantee their advocates a speedy burial.

Jesus chose the child, the type of free, spontaneous, and creative energy, as the pattern for the members of His Kingdom, and it is these characteristics of life which the struggle against materialism has reasserted. Indeed, whether we appeal to the experts or to the writers of popular fiction and drama, who are perhaps the most reliable representatives of educated opinion, everywhere we find the same plea for the emancipation of life, the same assertion of its right of lordship. Whether Christian or no in the technical sense of the term, this generation has little difficulty in accepting the outlook and standards of Jesus : His great sayings, " Life is more than meat," and " A man's life consists not in the multitude of the things that he possesses," might stand as the mottoes of the time ; and even the testimony of His disciple, " In Him was life and the life was the light of men," would commend itself increasingly as a creed. For under such circumstances it is not surprising that the most striking feature of the religious situation should be the concentration of interest upon the central figure of the Gospels, a serious study of the records, and a deepened reverence for His teaching and example. Aided by the progress of critical knowledge, which has done much to strip His portrait of the meretricious ornaments of traditional

piety, vast numbers of thinking men and women have felt and responded to the appeal of the Son of Man, and have found in Him a truth and a power which conventional Christianity had effectually overlaid. A fresh realisation of the revolutionary character of His sayings, and of the radical demand of a claim which is emphasised by the whole story of His Ministry and Passion, has restored once more His ancient power to captivate the imagination, evoke the loyalty, illuminate the intelligence, and renew the will of mankind. Probably at no time since the early days has there been a greater eagerness for uncompromising discipleship, or a more general agreement as to the reality of communion with Him, not as with a dead prophet, but as with a living and present Saviour and Friend. If this experience is, as many would maintain, the central fact in Christianity, then the future of Christendom is indeed full of hope. The whole world is looking for a leader : it has tested the claims of other ways of life and found them intolerable in theory and disastrous in practice. There is at present in Western Europe no other name by which men can think that they will be saved : a mass of testimony past and contemporary is available as to the adequacy of the Christ : a study of the Gospels lays a foundation for the belief that in Him will be found what all are seeking, Way and Truth and Life : it only remains to make Him known, to demonstrate by preaching and in action the meaning of His message for the individual and for society, and to summon mankind in its hour of need to the fellowship of His followers.

To state the task so is obviously to give a false impression of its scope, to suggest that the chief need is for an immediate increase of preachers and testimony meetings, for a further plunge into paroxysms of restlessness. Yet this is far from being the conviction of those who have felt most deeply the urgency of the times, and have been driven by them to a recovery of

faith in Christ. Rather they realise, as they study His life and experience His presence in all His contrast with their own sin and the sin of human society, that His cause, the cause of God's children, will only be hindered by shallow and clamorous advocacy. To enrol for the service of the Kingdom instincts unsublimated, hearts unregenerate, minds stored with prejudice, wills still self-centred, however strong the temptation to win support by debasing His standards and cheapening the price of discipleship—this is to repeat the chief cause of past failures ; it is to slam the front door of the Temple in the face of the Devil while beckoning him to enter thinly disguised at the back. Seeing the consequences of apostasy in the lurid hell of war, and tracing them back to their origin in ourselves, we are beginning to learn afresh the lesson which the saints would have taught us : the lesson that man needs not an example but a Saviour, and that salvation is no matter of glib phrases and orgies of emotion, but a lifelong discipline demanding not only the experience of communion with God in Christ, but the deliberate effort to consecrate the whole life, personal and corporate, to Him ; to sublimate every impulse under the spontaneous control of His influence; to formulate all thought in terms of a Christ-centred philosophy, and to test every action by its conformity with His purpose for the world. "I live ; yet not I : Christ liveth in me"—cant and self-deception have sometimes made the utterance of this tremendous claim seem attainable and even easy. We who know our animal heredity, our acquisitiveness and snobbery, our cowardice and Pharisaism, our self-seeking and forgetfulness of God, can only echo the confession with which Athanasius shattered Arianism : "Truly Christ must be divine if He can save such men as we." We know that for us as for Him redemption means the Cross : we too must lose life if we are to gain it ; and that is a process never easy nor ever free from pain.

It is one and perhaps the chief reason for the present decline of religious institutions that men, still reverencing the Church as holy and knowing how very hard it is to be a Christian, feel themselves unfit for her membership. It is one reason, but does not stand alone. In face of a situation so critical and so full of promise for Christendom, the Church is confessedly a failure. It is a bitter and an ungracious task for one who owes an incalculable debt to her to comment upon her defects and to swell the chorus of censure. But if we are to appreciate her position, the ugly business of diagnosis cannot be shirked. For she should surely take the lead in winning the world, this penitent and bewildered world, for Christ, since this is the very purpose that she was first commissioned to fulfil. Certainly the organised communions of Christendom—societies still possessed of great prestige and power, wealthy alike in men and resources, and united at least in their common allegiance to Jesus and their common recognition of the primary duty of evangelisation—should be the first to read the signs of the times and to see in them an unique opportunity. Here is an age wherein the old illusions and the old idolatries have been for the moment rudely dethroned, when men are longing to hear news of a deliverer, and when the figure of Jesus is being studied with a fresh devotion and accepted with a revival of enthusiasm. And far beyond the ranks of its professed members multitudes are looking wistfully to the Church to see if she can meet their need and reveal to them the secret of life which she claims to possess. In all her age-long history, since that first century which this time of ours in so many respects remarkably resembles, there has never been a season so favourable. Surely, the onlooker would imagine, she will forswear all minor issues and concentrate her every resource upon the business of proclaiming Him who was hailed as "a light to

lighten the Gentiles," Him " in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." And at present she does nothing of the kind.

What is needed first is obviously the recovery of a sense of proportion, a clear vision of the object for which she exists in order that, this once seen, she may overhaul her whole apparatus with a view to subordinating it to its proper purpose. At present her leaders, clerical and lay alike, are too often guilty of the idolatry of making means into ends, of setting themselves to procure larger attendance at public worship, or a more dignified ceremonial, or a greater number of clubs and guilds, or a reform of social abuses, and of allowing these excellent by-products to be divorced from the Kingdom of God or even to take its place. Meditation and study, prayer and fellowship, are crowded out in a round of ceaseless activities ; and in consequence the practice of the presence of God is neglected, and the activities fail to reveal Him and become spiritually worthless, and even harmful. For man needs God far more than brilliant oratory or well-rendered music, or billiards and whist-drives, or even temperance and housing-reform. These are valuable enough : they may lead men to Christ if their use is controlled by that motive : too often they take His place, and in pursuit of them men forfeit their souls. For they are not good in themselves : only God is good in Himself : and these things have ultimate value only as they help us to live in Him. Jesus said plainly that they should be added when and if men sought first His Kingdom and righteousness. We too often reverse His order, seeking first the consequences of faith, and reaching neither them nor the life which they should manifest but may easily obscure. Is God the supreme reality ? If not, then let us by all means imitate the Gentiles—and cease to profess Christianity.

An instance closely modelled upon many in the

recent history of Anglicanism will illustrate the reality of this particular danger. A prophet arises and sets himself to initiate a movement for renewal and reform. He sees that what is needed is to "put first things first and keep second things second," and gathers a group nominally like-minded with himself. He outlines to them his proposals, speaking of the need for God, the reality of Christ, the joy and power of life in Him, and then of the defects and shortcomings of our service. The earlier part of his speech sounds familiar: it is just what every parson thinks that he is saying every Sunday. "Vague," says one; "unpractical," says another; "we're all doing that, or at least preaching it, all our lives," is the verdict. But when he comes to criticism of details the attitude of his audience changes. Each scents an opportunity of parading his favourite hobby. All are agreed that the system is at fault: all are enthusiastic in their desire to meddle with the wheels and pulleys of the ecclesiastical machine. Taking for granted that the mechanism serves a worthy end, and that if only it is made efficient men will become Christian, every one of them is eager to improve it, to patch and polish, alter and adjust. At once there is a flood of criticism and suggestion. "Give them Evening Communion: at present we are excommunicating thirty per cent of the faithful." "What I want to see is a return to Gregorians and the use of Sarum: the anarchy and ugliness of our services are to blame." "What the laity want is a shortened and revised prayer-book and a 'live' sermon." "How can you expect the working-man to appreciate Christ while the Church never speaks out except in defence of the capitalist?" "The great trouble I find arises from Bishops' Palaces and the iniquities of private patronage." "What about pew-rents and tithes?" A hubbub of voices arises, and at first it looks as if none of the proposals will command a clear majority. It is hopeless to

tackle an issue on which party feeling runs strong; and social problems lie too far outside the interests of most Church people. Clearly something constitutional will best serve to rally support; for no one, except the Bishop of Durham, seems happy about the Establishment. And so at last the campaign which was undertaken to recall the Church to Christ shapes itself into a massed attack upon, say, the parson's freehold—a subject which all the reformers, being vigorous and popular, can assail without personal danger. Here is a concrete issue on which Church historians and Church lawyers, those august guardians of the Tradition of the Elders, can spend many a happy field-day. Tactical experts, publicists, platform-speakers, organising secretaries, an office staff, a slogan, and an appeal for funds are all duly settled—and Satan, who knows that side-tracking is the surest method of obstruction, scores another triumph, and can leave the Church of England for a year or two to his own devices.

The fact is, of course, that she is still suffering from a century of acute controversy over matters of secondary importance and cannot easily shake off the habits then formed. When she awoke from the long indifference of Hanoverian days, a succession of movements, roughly representative of the various parties to the Elizabethan settlement, urged their programmes upon her. In each case men of real vision and spirituality were the pioneers. But their Epigoni were of lesser stature. Crusades degenerated into vendettas; and a vast amount of energy was dissipated over quarrels that brought little but discredit upon their protagonists and upon the Church, which was the chief sufferer from their violence.

The same policy of attacking error rather than of upholding righteousness, of relapsing from the positives of the Sermon on the Mount to the negatives of the Decalogue, is as evident in personal as it is in

corporate religion. We find it easier to be under the law than under grace : the Stoicism of the great Victorians still holds us in thrall. And so we try to fight sins piecemeal, striving with efforts as heroic as they are ineffective to repress our tempers, our lusts, our dishonesties of act and speech, our ambitions and our discontents, when we ought to be filling our lives with things that are lovely and pure and just and of good report. We cast out with infinite labour one devil from the house of our soul, and leave it swept and garnished for his return with seven companions more evil than himself. The psychologists are only echoing Christ's teaching when they warn us that sin cannot be conquered by such methods. Asceticism, the repression of instincts, can produce at its best only a distorted or mutilated nature, not the full free manhood of the Master's stature. It is as futile as the attempt to cure a case of measles by poulticing the spots. Our business as Christians is of a more radical kind. To fill our lives with a passion for God, to consecrate our impulses to His joyous service, to see the world sacramentally all radiant with the light of His presence, and to combat vice and failure by holding up in character and speech the glory of the Christian ideal—that is the true path of reform.

We have already imagined an illustration of this superficial method of dealing with abuses in Church life : one typical of its disastrous effects in the more personal sphere may well be added. For a generation or more the problem of purity has taken a chief place in the religious life of our public schools. House-masters wear themselves into the grave in the attempt to keep their boys straight and clean. Sex temptations become to many of them an obsession, colouring their whole outlook, so that they cannot see friendship between boys of different ages without at once suspecting and showing that they suspect evil. And yet they fail, and fail lamentably and inevitably. For they

have adopted the method of repression, crushing down as impure that first fine rapture of adolescence, that wholly spiritual and sexless hero-worship which is the earliest and almost the loveliest flower of the emotional life. They have suppressed it by violence, driving underground instincts which should have been brought out into the open and exalted by devotion to God the great lover, instincts which when driven to secrecy and subterfuge break out in all manner of poisonous perversions. In doing so they too often share the fate of Marcus Aurelius, that noble prototype of the strong silent Englishman, and produce a Commodus as the result of their discipline. In doing so they rob human life of its vigour and its glory, of that capacity for honest affection which Christ saw in Peter when He charged the hard-handed, rough-tongued fisherman with the task of feeding His lambs, justifying the commission by reason of the Apostle's capacity for love. Passion, like life, is dangerous : granted. Passion, like life, can be sublimated if it cannot be repressed : repression has plainly failed : Christ has entrusted to His Church the secret of a more excellent way.

The recovery of a sense of values is, however, sorely hindered by the persistence of abuses and of archaic ideas and methods in Church life. While our goal must be the attainment and propagation of life in Christ, the remedy of evils, the reinterpretation of belief, and the creation of adequate machinery to give belief its expression are only wrong when they distract us from its pursuit. At present we are in a vicious circle. Defective institutions and out-of-date survivals prevent us from seeing God plainly, and until we see Him we cannot repair the one or remove the other with any consistency. It is certainly arguable that in the work of practical reform, always provided that reform is seen not as an end in itself but as a means towards fuller life in God, will be found the

easiest way of escape: certainly both tasks, the testing of all existing methods and machinery by the question, "Does this mediate to men the Spirit of Christ?" and the rejection or reconstruction of what fails to answer satisfactorily, should go on side by side. If at present they do not do so, it is because few are yet prepared for such a testing, and those who like the Bishop of Peterborough in his First Charge advocate it, do not venture to apply it drastically enough. And so we hurry from one bit of mechanism to another, though it is plain that it is rather shortage of petrol than any structural defect that is bringing the engine to a standstill. Some day, probably too late to meet the crisis, we shall learn that freedom is of little use to a corpse, that life once secured will inevitably lead to liberty.

There is, indeed, a close parallel between ecclesiastical and social reform in this respect. Social reformers, like Churchmen, have too often been content to attack particular problems in isolation and by proposals beneficial perhaps but unrelated to any clear ideal of the ultimate welfare of the whole corporate life of humanity. They are attempting to build the City of God without any coherent notion of its lay-out and design. House by house and street by street they are sweeping away the old and evil dwellings, to make room for something worthier perhaps, but put up without any idea of its contributing to the final harmony and perfection of the whole. One block of buildings is constructed on a strictly socialist model: next door is a sample of the work of an enlightened believer in individual enterprise: beyond it spring up a multitude of erections displaying every variation between the rigidly traditional and the wildly anarchic. The New Jerusalem, however great its beauty of detail, must strike an observant archangel as a mere Babel in stone, each edifice expressing itself in a language discordant from all the rest. These many

styles might perhaps produce a fresh type of architecture if they were synthesised in one master plan : meanwhile they are only a jumble of unrelated fragments. Reformers must agree about the ground-plan and character of the whole before they can lay foundations for the construction of its parts. Perhaps as they build they will discover the need for wider vision and more fundamental study of principles. It is easier, and to many it seems more practical, to mess about with bricks and mortar than to labour over learning the mysteries of design : but the surveyors and architects ought surely to be set to work before we worry about engaging builders.

So with the Church, if she is to rise again after her confessed failure and to seize the opportunity of the present crisis, she must cease busying herself about " side-shows " and concentrate her resources upon the fundamental duty of evangelism. To be the instrument of God's Spirit in the world, to mediate His life to mankind through the sacramental means of grace, that is through her every activity, to proclaim her Lord as Life and Light and Love, and to bring all her members into living communion with the risen Christ, this is her supreme task. Handicapped for it she unquestionably is by her inheritance of inappropriate formularies and reactionary traditions, antiquated organisation, and scandalous abuses : yet the reform of these, attractive as it is, must not be allowed to become a first charge upon her energies. They must wait for a less fateful season : for if now she rises to the height of her calling, these things will be rapidly changed ; if she fails, it will hardly matter what happens to them, since some other institution will have taken her place. Whatever the obstacles, " put first things first " must be her watchword : it ought never to have been forgotten.

Yet even a concentration upon fundamentals is no simple matter. For during the century of renaissance

through which she has been passing half-unconscious of the changes in progress around her, while her attention has been fixed upon secondary questions like the precise meaning of inspiration or the legitimate use of ritual, she has hardly yet realised the vast contribution of the new learning to religion or the importance of interpreting her central truth afresh in the light of it. It can hardly be disputed that if her claim that God is in Christ reconciling the world to Himself stands unshaken, much of what formerly passed as immutable and essential has been gravely modified if not wholly overthrown. The new physical sciences have rendered untenable the traditional ideas of authority, of the supernatural, of miracles, and in fact of the whole method of God's operation : mechanical notions of inspiration whether of the Bible or of the Councils of the first millennium, magical theories of prayer or of sacraments, doctrines of divine impassibility imported from Greek philosophy or of divine ruthlessness and caprice inherited from the Old Testament, and concepts of deity borrowed from earthly palaces or camps or law-courts—to insist upon these is to brand oneself as either ignorant or insincere. The new history has profoundly modified the traditional portrait of Christ : for tradition in ages mad for miracle has emphasised many features of the record which are now proved to be of questionable authenticity or of different meaning, and has obscured much of intense interest and supreme religious value : despite the imaginative vagaries of certain critics and the obstinate resistance of many reactionaries, it is plain that a new knowledge of Jesus as He was upon earth has become possible, and that this knowledge necessitates large changes in our presentation of His life and in our interpretation of the doctrines of His Person and work. The new philosophy has made the traditional language of dogmatic theology almost unintelligible without an apparatus of translation and

exegesis : technical terms like substance and person have either become meaningless or are now used with an altered significance : if the creeds be not rewritten, they must at least be explained afresh. The new psychology is challenging many of the traditional concepts as to the nature and relationships of men, of the character of sin and the process of salvation : moral theology needs revision almost as badly as dogma. And if psychic research should emerge from the empirical stage of its development and become psychic science, we shall certainly have to do a vast deal of readjustment in almost every department of Christian thought.

So bald and brief a statement may at least give some idea of the scope of our need for study. To " put first things first " demands not only an agreement as to what are " first things," but also an earnest endeavour to express them in terms of our own time. It is perfectly useless, indeed it is demonstrably harmful, to proclaim Christ in phrases which to most educated hearers seem either cant or lies, or with presuppositions which can only be accepted on the basis of *Credo quia absurdum*. Unfortunately the theological faculties of our Universities, to which naturally the Church would look for guidance, are still in the grip of a rigid and tyrannical convention. When they ought to be pressing on to meet the needs of the time they are refusing to leave the beggarly elements of Hebrew and Greek. Theology to its professors seems to mean little more than a minute acquaintance with the linguistic and textual problems of the Scriptures and with the niceties of fourth-century controversies, as if a detailed study of the authorship of Isaiah or of the manuscript evidence for a few verses in the Gospels helped a man to see God or to preach Christ. And if the professional theologians are blind to their responsibilities, those who see the need and are qualified to meet it are sorely

hindered by the present state of party-feeling from making any honest and united attempt to reach agreement. For Catholics and Evangelicals the mere admission that certain aspects of religion require restatement is tantamount to a confession of disloyalty: to be willing to unite with members of another school is to become a suspect and an outcast. Fear of splitting the party, fear of offending the consciences of the simple, fear of being accused of Modernism, fear that one's own faith will not survive exposure to fresh light, all these make it hard even for sincere students to speak their minds freely. And apart from the students are the masses who howl out "heresy" at the bidding of the Press and without the faintest understanding of the problems under discussion or of the religion which they are clamorous to defend. So long as Anglo-Catholics refuse to condemn the perversities of Mr. N. P. Williams and the dishonesty of St. Saviour's Hoxton; so long as Evangelicals are afraid to close the purse strings of the champions of literal inspiration, and spend their time searching for formulae which shall leave liberty for themselves while satisfying the readers of the *Life of Faith*; so long as Liberals are represented by a group of academic and negative intellectuals, out of touch with the life of the parochial clergy and with the aspirations and needs of democracy; so long it will not be easy to secure a concentration of effort or to allow the English genius for meeting an emergency to have free play.

And yet difficult as is the position, there is much that is full of hope. After all, the Anglican Communion stands alone in being at once Catholic and Reformed, in having proved itself able to hold fast the authentic deposit of the faith while freely restating its doctrines and remodelling its organisation. And those who now deny its right to do so are simply repudiating the historical basis of its existence. It is the fashion nowadays, when we are all reacting against the ex-

cessive individualism of the past century, among those who look backwards rather than forwards to idealise mediaevalism and even to regard the whole Reformation as a disastrous mistake. How any one can imagine that the England of the Wars of the Roses was healthier or happier, freer or more creative, than the England of Elizabeth or even of Cromwell, is a problem perhaps insoluble, despite the limitless capacity of human minds for self-deception : such a belief implies either a defective standard of values or an amazing blindness to the plain facts of history. And if the changes of the sixteenth century involved a vast enrichment of every department of life, no small portion of that result is due to those who delivered us from the Roman allegiance. Fortunately such perverse repinings are wholly futile, except in their power to divert energy and thus obstruct progress : we can no more restore the mediaeval guilds than we can the mediaeval handicrafts or the mediaeval superstition ; the attempt to do so produces nothing but faked antiques for the gratification of the affected and the amusement of the dilettanti. Industrialism like the Reformation, in spite of the tragedies which accompanied them both, has created for man an equipment possessed of the highest potential value and capable of yielding noble and righteous service. If at present machinery seems to have got beyond control and to be the master rather than the servant of life, our business is to learn the use of our new resources, not to try to return to days long past and methods long happily abandoned. If I were to get rid of my very dilapidated pony-cart and procure a Rolls-Royce, my friends would question my sanity if I were to smash the car in a fit of annoyance at the complexity of its construction and try to buy back the derelict remains of my trap. And that is just what the obscurantists in Church and State who are crying out " Back to the Middle Ages " are doing.

Pessimism and timidity will always in times of crisis look wildly backward. Through the whole content of the Christian Gospel runs a strain of deathless hope. The best is before us, not behind.

If the elders among us are tired and disillusionised by the long strain of war, the generation that will soon, and the sooner the better, take their places is less ill-qualified for its task. Throughout the world of student life there is an enthusiasm for religious and social reform perhaps unparalleled in our history. For the first time, at least in recent years, Jesus Christ is claiming the physically and mentally best for the service of His Kingdom. They provide the material by which the New Reformation will be accomplished. If only the Church of England can commend herself to them as the society in which they can find fellowship with God and inspiration for the fulfilment of His will, the transition from old to new may well be made without the violence and waste of the sixteenth century. At present, it is true, numbers of them refuse to enter her ministry or even to take an active part in her life, not so much for financial reasons or even through disgust at her scandals and ineffectiveness, as because they do not see in her the devotion to Jesus which is central to their own conception of Christianity, or any marked evidence of the fruits of His Spirit. To put first things first would have an immediate effect upon them. Most of those who now stand aloof would be won to membership, and with them the movements towards evangelism, towards reunion, and towards reform would be immensely strengthened.

And along with this revival among the young has come, though much less obviously, a wide and, considering the difficulties, a rapid change in the general outlook of Anglicans. Since the war the claim of the Church of England to stand for a reasonable faith and to revise statements of doctrine and formularies of worship, as well as methods of organisation and the

basis of her constitution, has been securely established : and if a Reformation is needed this is the first condition for its inception within the Church. Having discovered by contact with the masses of the country's manhood in camps and trenches how complete had been the failure of organised religion, clergy both at home and abroad were driven to penitence and to liberty of experiment. These ordinary English men and women were clearly fine material for the Kingdom : they were evidently uninfluenced by the conventional modes of preaching and teaching, institution and activity : if they were to be won, a new presentation of the Gospel and new ways of expressing Christianity in thought and life must be adopted. Some indeed of the clergy could not shake themselves free from previous habits and prejudices, and hastened to lay the blame for failure rather upon " this people which knoweth not the law " than upon themselves and their traditions. But numbers of them all over the country have tacitly recognised the need for drastic change, and are continuing and extending the experiments preparatory to it.

It is no exaggeration to say that a new type of Anglican has been developed in the past decade, a type distinct from any of the existing parties though having links with them all and including among its representatives members of each. These " Moderns " are Catholic as opposed to Protestant in that for them religion is necessarily a corporate as well as a personal experience, embracing in its appeal every department of life and of character : they are convinced that the Gospel has a message for society, that beauty is as divine as truth and goodness, that life is sacramental through and through, and that while large liberty must be allowed for varieties of temperament and expression, unity is as necessary an ideal for the Church as holiness. They are in the true sense Evangelical in their preaching of Christ and Him crucified, and in their insistence

upon personal communion with Him and upon the Cross as the one way of Atonement : while dissatisfied with any evangelism which substitutes "glory for me" for a call to life-long adventure in a fellowship of suffering, they are convinced that nothing can take the place of personal discipleship, that conversion must lead to a life manifested by the fruits of the Spirit, and that the Church's prime duty is the winning of souls. At the same time they are markedly Liberal in their attitude towards authority and in their desire for truth, passionately sincere in their determination to "prove all things," and fearless in accepting the guidance of modern knowledge and in bringing every discovery to bear upon the study and interpretation of religion : if they differ from the old-fashioned Broad Churchman it is that their thought is positive and constructive, occupied rather with presenting the Gospel in terms of to-day than with the attack upon error and superstition. Such a type may fairly claim to be the legitimate successor to the threefold heritage of Anglicanism.

We have spoken of this group rather as a type than as a party ; for at present its members have resisted the temptation to form a separate organisation. Working happily within their own parties they are united by community of outlook more than by policy and programme. Their influence is on that account directed towards reformation by consent and from within the Church, not by conflict and a fresh schism ; and though in the present condition of affairs a sudden event, such as for instance an official verdict against Modernism or a serious set-back to the cause of reunion with the Free Churches, might compel them to organise their ranks and undertake concerted action, the probability is that they will continue and carry through the task of recalling the Church to her traditional character, and of enabling her to meet the present unparalleled opportunity in a spirit truly catholic, truly evangelical,

and truly progressive. If they can secure a measure of sympathy and co-operation between parties, and a concentration of their several activities upon the same great objective, the Reformation may take place without disruption or important secessions. Like Erasmus and Colet and More, they do not despair of the Church's power to rise to the new responsibilities and set her own house in order. And in spite of a frank recognition of the difficulties, and moments of doubt as to the vitality of these dry bones, they have since the war received such manifest encouragement that the risk of a break with the past is steadily diminishing, and the future is bright with hope.

The Anglican Communion owes its existence to the circumstances of a very similar epoch: it is the concrete proof that God has used and blessed the genius of Englishmen for interpreting His truth in the terms and methods of a new time. Anglicans have a great and glorious inheritance and a peculiar and sacred responsibility, since to-day the very quality of the age cries aloud for the exercise of the special talent committed to them. The whole circumstances are those of a Renaissance: everywhere a fresh movement of the human spirit is evident: everywhere there is need for the guidance which Christians believe can be given by God in Christ alone. It is still not too late for a great revival: to win the world for Christ has never been so plain and immediate a possibility. If only the religious institutions of Christendom can hear the call and obey it, the new age may see the coming of things long awaited, of a splendour hitherto seen only in dreams. And no other denomination has so great an opportunity as the Anglican Church, whether we look to its past history or its present equipment or its future potentialities. Rome clad in all the prestige and panoply of sovereignty sits like Canute before the incoming tide: unlike the king she is chained to an immovable throne: she has committed herself to

an obstinate resistance to the social and intellectual movement of the time, pitting an outworn philosophy and a rigid organisation against forces which are inevitably destroying her. The Free Churches, with their exaggerated individualism and consequent tolerance of schism, in discovering the needs of the day are discovering also that the historical causes for their separation have long since disappeared, and if Anglicans reform themselves reunion will not be long delayed. Attractive to us all as must be the hope that the Church of England will ultimately be enabled to use her unique position for the uniting of the ancient Catholic Churches with those denominations that owe their origin to the Reformation, it is plain that such a possibility is at present remote. Our immediate task would seem to be the promotion of a strong and if possible united evangelistic movement within the Church, a movement planned with the sympathy and, if practicable, the concurrent support of the Free Churches. Recent experience in simultaneous missions has shown the power of such activities not only to extend the Kingdom, but to create mutual trust and affection between the various bodies taking part in them, and so to produce a widespread recognition of the evils of division and a popular demand for reunion. For co-operation in the work of making disciples rapidly discloses how great and how fundamental are the matters upon which Christians of all types speak with one voice. Beliefs will be restated, machinery overhauled, scandals removed, and the Reformation accomplished as we learn humbly and whole-heartedly to throw ourselves into the gigantic and sorely needed task of world-wide evangelisation. It should be the privilege of the Church of England, if she is true to her character, to take the lead in such an adventure.

VII

THE LAMBETH "APPEAL" AND ITS RESULTS

BY

THE MOST REV. H. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D., D.C.L.

FORMERLY ARCHBISHOP OF MELBOURNE

SYNOPSIS

Reunion in the Lambeth Conference, 1908.
Further advances in 1920.
Conditions of union permissible in the Anglican Communion.
The great task of the National Assembly.
Negotiations with non-Episcopal Churches in England.
The Creed of the Church.
The Orthodox Eastern Church.
The Swedish Church.
The Mission-fields of South India.
The Latin Communion.

VII

THE LAMBETH "APPEAL" AND ITS RESULTS

The "Appeal"

The object of this essay is to define as briefly as possible the attitude of the Anglican Communion to the question of Re-union as decided by the Lambeth Conferences of 1908 and 1920, and then to examine what is being done and how far difficulties are beginning to emerge which must be removed before the goal aimed at can be reached.

The *Appeal to all Christian People* issued in 1920 was no hastily conceived utterance. In 1908 the subject of Re-union was advanced by a Resolution of the Conference, which gave new hope, especially to the Dominions beyond the Seas, and prepared every one for the further advance in 1920. Resolution 75 of 1908 said :

> In the welcome event of any project of re-union between any Church of the Anglican Communion and any Presbyterian or other non-Episcopal Church which, while preserving the Faith in its integrity and purity, has also exhibited care as to the form and intention of ordination to the ministry, reaching the stage of responsible official negotiation, it might be possible to make an approach to re-union on lines suggested by such precedents as those of 1610. Further in the opinion of the Conference it might be possible to authorise arrangements (for the period of transition towards full union on the basis of Episcopal Ordination) which would respect the convictions of

those who had not received Episcopal Orders without involving any surrender on our part of the principle laid down in the Preface to the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer.

"The Precedents of 1610" involve consecration to the Episcopate *per saltum*, and the Resolution plainly implies that it might be possible to admit to the Episcopate of a United Church men not already in Anglican Orders. It further contemplated a period of transition during which recognition might be given to ministers not fully commissioned by the United Church. How and under what conditions this was to be done were not defined. That such a transitional period was probable was admitted, but this would pass away when all those ordained to the ministry of a United Church were received as possessing a ministry recognised by all the uniting sections of the Church.

The effect of the decisions of 1908 was felt in every country of the globe, and the way was thus prepared for the important results announced in 1920. The Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, which contains Resolution 9, "An Appeal to all Christian People," was received everywhere with what can be called only joyful surprise. The "Appeal" has been translated into Latin, Greek, Russian, French, Italian, and German, and its voice has been heard in all lands. During the period from 1908 to 1920 the subject of reunion was never lost sight of in England or beyond the Seas, and many conferences were held throughout the British Empire and in America, which kindled anew the hope of union and made the resolutions and pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 possible. After the first welcome given to these utterances doubts began to be expressed as to the possibility of any corporate union, but during the present year there has been abundant evidence that the cause is still living, nor does any one wish to see it abandoned as a goal to be reached. It is abundantly

evident, I think, to the whole Church that the Lambeth Conference has never propounded any scheme of union to be imposed in its name upon the Church. In this attitude of careful recognition of local rights and constitutional authority, the Conference, ever since its first gathering of 1867, has won for itself an influence throughout the world. It has defined the necessary conditions upon which the Anglican Communion can approach re-union, and left every detail within these conditions to the wisdom of each separate part.

Resolution 11 of 1920 clearly defines this position :

> The Conference recognises that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions must be undertaken by the various national regional or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion and confidently commits to them the carrying out of this task on lines that are in general harmony with the principles underlying its Appeal and Resolutions.

Resolution 12 goes further in the direction of defining action in view of the prospects and projects of re-union (A) :

> (i.) A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorisation to ministers not episcopally ordained who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in Churches within his Diocese and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the Churches of such ministers.
>
> (ii.) The Bishops of the Anglican Communion will not question the action of any Bishop who in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union shall countenance the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of the non-Episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme.
>
> (iii.) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestion contained in the Report of the Sub-Committee on Re-union with non-Episcopal Churches in reference to the status and work of ministers who may remain after union without Episcopal Ordination (see pages 142 and 143).

This last is so important that whilst we cannot quote the suggestions in full we must give the substance of them. In speaking of the great freedom which must be left to local negotiations, there is a warning against too great independence of action in one place which may compromise action already taken elsewhere in stricter conformity with the words of the resolutions.

Some Provinces of our Communion (p. 143), while agreeing to unite with a non-Episcopal Communion on the basis of the acceptance of Episcopacy for the future, might be faced with the necessity of providing for the contingency that many ministers who at the time of the union were working in the non-Episcopal community, would remain after the union without Episcopal Ordination. The following suggestions appear to us to satisfy the conditions of local freedom explained above :

(*a*) Ministers of both the uniting Communions should be at once recognised as of equal status in all Synods and Councils of the United Church.

(*b*) The terms of union should not confer on non-Episcopal ordained ministers the right to administer the Holy Communion to those congregations which already possess an Episcopal minister but they should include the right to conduct other services and to preach in such Churches if licensed thereto by the Bishop.

(*c*) All other matters might well be left to the decision of the Provincial or General Synods of the United Church in full confidence that these Synods will take care not to endanger that fellowship with the universal Church which is our common ultimate aim.

Those of us who have been engaged for long years in negotiating for union know best the importance and value of the foregoing words. They provide for what is called a transitional period with a fulness and confidence which should meet all requirements when obstacles of other kinds have been removed.

We turn once more to the "Appeal," which recognises that the times call us to a new outlook and new measures. Section vi. defines once more, and more definitely, the essential condition of visible unity, viz.

the acceptance of the Holy Scriptures as the rule and ultimate standard of faith, the creed commonly called Nicene as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ, and a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the commission of Christ, and the authority of the whole body.

A claim is then made for the Episcopate as the means of providing such a ministry. This is done without calling in question the spiritual reality of other ministries, and it is added, "we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father in God."

The appeal for union in a common ministry is based on the way of mutual deference to each other's consciences. Here we reach in the "Appeal" its sincere offer to assist as far as possible in ending disunion:

> Section viii. We who send forth this appeal would say that, if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, the terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and Clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life . . . we can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a United Church.
>
> It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through Episcopal Ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

The effect of this mutual exchange of commissions and this merging into one channel all the different

gifts of grace bestowed on the ministry is thus described —" We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a re-united Church, and imploring for ourselves God's grace and strength to fulfil the same."

It will be observed that every commission received in the United Church will possess such complete authority as the United Church can bestow, and the succession with the past, with all it really means in Church history, will be secured by the adoption of Episcopacy, and continuance of all for which as an historical fact the Church of England has contended. I hope I may be pardoned for saying that these are the very conclusions arrived at in 1907–1908 in a Conference between the Church of England in Australia and the Presbyterian Church there.

They were received at the time with misgivings and fear, but the last fourteen years have demonstrated their value, and the experiences of the Great War showed the possibility of common action and the wastefulness of disunited efforts. Nor can the influence of two important books which appeared before the Conference in 1920 be overlooked.

(1) *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, edited by Dr. Swete. (2) *The Bampton Lectures*, 1920, by Dr. Headlam. These two works with their wealth of learning and their fearlessness to face anew all that the continued study of Church history had to reveal, played an important part in fashioning the opinion of many members of the Lambeth Conference in 1920. Beyond all this, however, we can none of us refuse to see the presence of the Holy Spirit of God in His guidance of the Church.

Its Results

I have dwelt thus long upon the " Appeal " because it is essential that its principles and aims should be

presented in the simplest form possible. We are now to look at some of the results already obtained.

The Bishops of the Overseas Dioceses left England in 1920 with the intention of carrying out the hope of the Conference in their several spheres of work. During the last two years, reports have arrived in England of much which has been accomplished. Briefly it may be stated that the effect of the "Appeal" has called the Church in every branch of it to renewed action. In Australia and Canada especially, the subject of Re-union has been taken up anew with a resolve to accomplish all that is possible, though no definite decisions have yet been reached.

The National Assembly

The hope of re-union in England centres at present round the work of the National Assembly. Here for the first time in its modern history the Church, with its laity exercising a constitutional voice and vote, has its opportunity of making known its mind.

In the past the best Churchmen have rightly complained of the limitations imposed on the National Church, of abuses recognised and impatiently tolerated, and of the costly and dilatory methods whereby the smallest reform could be obtained. In proportion as the National Assembly performs its great tasks, removing abuses of every kind and carrying out long-delayed reforms, will be its influence and service to the Church. Every one recognises that there can be no United Church in England until the age-long demands for changes in the Church of England have been met and granted. The spirit of fear and timidity must not be allowed to impede the gathering force of resolve to accomplish long-delayed reforms. There are those who contend that this cannot be done so long as the Church occupies any fixed relationship to the State. The question does not arise in the

Dominions beyond the Seas, because starting at first with the ideal of an established and endowed Church this has now everywhere been abolished, and the Church is free to enter into any and every alliance or union so long as the laws adopted by Synods do not violate the State laws. Many of us with experience abroad feel that the position in England is different from that of other parts of the Empire, and we are by no means disposed to demand a complete severance from all but the absolutely necessary secular relations with the State. We rather hope that England may be able to maintain a national recognition of religion. In all temporal matters there can be but one national authority, and to this the Church must submit. Her members are also citizens and they can claim no exemption from the general laws governing others.

History, viewed apart from political influences and in spite of much which every Churchman deplores, records for England an age-long connection between the Church and the State which is interwoven with the history of each. I feel that the coming years will largely determine what shall be done, and there is at present no need for any of us to take sides in discussions which may prove rather a hindrance than an advantage to the cause of Church union. The right of the Church to define its faith in Courts of its own will surely be easier to obtain now that the Church of Scotland has successfully received from the Imperial Parliament the right to define its doctrine, a right which it has long treasured so highly and worthily, and at the same time to retain its position as the National Church of Scotland.

Besides, a United Church in England will be in a very true sense of the word national, and may itself desire to retain what is implied in the term, because the causes which in the past led to disunion and separation have in the course of time been largely removed, and what many of our forefathers contended for has

been granted. Such a Church, if it is to bear the title of National, must be comprehensive in things non-essential. A Church resting upon insecure and undefined doctrinal foundations is only preparing for itself greater disunion and disaster than those which we all of us at present deplore.

To refer to some matters now prominent in the mind of the Church. (1) The adequate support of the ministry that it may continue to attract men whom the Church desires to have. (2) The question of Patronage, which shall secure to the parishes some recognised right to be heard in the choice of their Vicar, though not to control his selection. (3) The provision of pensions which can only be compulsory and in which the negotiating Churches have something to teach, because of their own successful dealing with the matter. (4) The settlement of repairs to the Vicarage houses. There will probably be no difficulty in England, as there has been none already abroad, in the parishes providing annually what is required for continuous repairs if only the right of the Vicar to borrow money on the benefice to build and alter the house at his own will be subjected to the consent of the Parochial Church Councils. These are only a few of the problems for the solution of which the Church is looking now in hope to the National Assembly. The older idea of increasing the endowments of parishes to any great extent will have to be abandoned as a general policy, and in the place of this the congregations must learn that they have a present-day duty to the ministry apart from endowments, as well as to the fabric of the Church and the maintenance of the services.

All experience in England as well as abroad goes to prove that this duty is accepted when the laity have assigned to them powers which are theirs by right of their Christian life. Rights and powers always carry with them responsibilities, and these will be accepted as soon as the Church convinces its members of its

desire to work for them, through them, and with them.

The work of the National Assembly has already accomplished much, and it is no exaggeration to say that more progress in the way of reform has resulted from its discussions and decisions of the last few years than was attained in a generation under the older conditions of Church life.

Voices are beginning to be heard about the weariness of so much public discussions and the time spent on so many questions bristling with difficulties and purely secular in character. These will be heard increasingly, and they must be disregarded. The Church of England has now its own self-governing machinery, and it must use it. For this purpose the machinery has been formed, and we must expect noises caused by the friction resulting from a new machine which has not yet reached the stage of quiet working.

The Chairman of the Life and Liberty Movement, which played so prominent a part in securing the Enabling Act, has recently said : " If we saw the faintest prospect of what we want to see done in the Church of England, either officially or under the auspices of any other group of people, we would close down at once. But we do not see that prospect, and therefore we carry on."

The National Assembly is engaged in clearing the site and mapping out the foundations in many temporal affairs on which the future United Church is to be built, and nothing must deter its members from proceeding with a task laid upon them by the whole Church. If the Assembly grows timid and fearful it will become faithless to the hopes which called it into existence, and which now look for accomplishment of so much reform, which, in the past, has been postponed with a dilatoriness which has caused many hearts to grow weary.

In England

A central conference composed of representatives of the Church of England and of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches has recently issued a report which we dare not summarise because of the importance of its words. We therefore give some extracts from it which deal with three great subjects :

Nature of the Church

As there is but one Christ and one Life in Him, so there is and can be but one Church.

This visible Church was instituted by Christ as a fellowship of men united with Him, and in Him with one another, to be His witness and His instrument in the spread of His Kingdom on earth.

As a visible Church it must possess certain visible and recognisable marks whereby it can be seen and known by men. These have been since the days of the Apostles at least the following : (*a*) the profession of faith in God as revealed and incarnate in Christ ; (*b*) the observance of the two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself ; (*c*) an ideal of the Christian life protected by a common discipline ; (*d*) a ministry, representative of the Church, for the preaching of the Word, the administration of the Sacraments, and the maintenance of the unity and continuity of the Church's witness and work.

The true relation of the Church and local Churches is that which is described in the New Testament—namely, that the Churches are the local representatives of the One Church. The actual situation brought about in the course of history in which there are different and even rival denominational Churches independent of each other and existing together in the same locality, whatever justification arising out of historical circumstances may be claimed for these temporary separations cannot be regarded as in accordance with the purpose of Christ, and every endeavour ought to be made to restore the true position as set forth in the New Testament.

The Ministry

In regard to the Ministry the report says no man can take this ministry upon himself. It must be conferred by the Church,

acting through those who have authority given to them in the Church to confer it. There must be not only an inward call of the spirit, but also an outward and visible call and commission by the Church.

In view of the fact that the Episcopate was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby this authority of the whole body is given, we agree that it ought to be accepted as such for the United Church of the future.

Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the Early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyterial and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

The acceptance of Episcopal ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

Place of the Creed

On the subject of the place of the Creed in a United Church, it is recommended that in a United Church there must be unity of faith, which implies both the subjective element of personal adhesion and an objective standard of truth.

When assent to the Creeds is required by the United Church such assent should not be understood to imply the acceptance of them as a complete expression of the Christian Faith or as excluding reasonable liberty of interpretation. It should be understood to imply the acceptance of them as agreeable to the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, as affirming essential elements in the Christian Faith, and as preserving that faith in the form in which it has been handed down.

While we thus recognise the rightful place of the Creeds in the United Church, we also recognise most fully and thankfully the continued Presence and Teaching of the Living Spirit in His Body, and emphasise the duty of the Church to keep its mind free and ready to receive from Him in each day

and generation ever-renewed guidance in the apprehension and expression of the truth.

Further Questions

A statement has been issued by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches which notes some practical difficulties still to be considered.

1. What is meant by "a representative and constitutional episcopate," and how the elements of presbyterial and congregational order may be combined with it.

2. The status of the existing Free Church ministry.

3. The relation of the Free Churches to Communions with which they are in fellowship in other parts of the world.

4. The problems connected with the union between Church and State.

5. The safeguarding of the evangelical principles of the Reformation.

No. (1) will receive its best illustration in the constitutions of the Church in the Dominions beyond the Seas, but (5) seems to imply that for themselves the writers will accept no return to many mediaeval doctrines rejected in the Reformation period, nor to some forms of worship in which these were embodied and expressed.

Church of Scotland

The Presbyterian Churches of Scotland have long been engaged on plans of union amongst themselves, and whilst the movement has proceeded with the national caution it has now reached the final stages, nor can its consummation be much longer delayed. There have been those in Scotland who have never lost sight of a larger union to which the eyes of others who know what the scholarship of the Church of Scotland has done for our common Christianity, have looked with hope and confidence.

A new step was taken in 1921 when the Archbishop of Canterbury visited Edinburgh to address the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. His words have been published by the S.P.C.K. under the title *Lambeth and Edinburgh*. A year later, in May 1922, the General Assembly of the United Free Church accepted the invitation of the Archbishop to a conference on the subject of the Ministry and Ordination, with a view of taking their share in a great enterprise with an open mind and a good heart. Thus is the cause of union progressing because the Christian world is weary of disunion, and is being led by the Spirit of God into better paths and wider fields. "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

The Creed of the Church

In the negotiations for union so far conducted there has been everywhere an acceptance of the Nicene Creed as the expression of the Church's fundamental articles of faith. This does no dishonour to the Apostle's Creed nor does it sacrifice the Athanasian Creed. The latter moves in regions of thought which ever and again will come into view, and when they do so the clarity of the Creed will justify its language even if the Church has outgrown the framework into which the whole is fitted.

With creeds, as with the language of Holy Scriptures it is evident that the two questions "It is Written" and "How readest Thou?" will perpetually arise.

The faith of the Church is guaranteed not by written words but by the Spirit of God ever present in the Church taking of the things of God and showing them to us. Without accepted sacred writings as the supreme authority and forms of words resting upon this authority, there can be no definite society of Christian people.

What the words mean for each generation can be

learnt by minds which bow before the power of the Holy Spirit of God, promised by Christ as the abiding presence, guiding men's hearts and thoughts. This is the foundation and security of our faith, and in proportion as we accept it we shall be ready to modify our convictions and change our views because we feel we are being led by the Spirit of God to truer thoughts and to better knowledge of the mind of Christ. The craving for an infallible guide is satisfied when we know that we are not left as orphaned or deserted children who cannot hear the Father's voice. This essay makes no claim to interpret the Creed of the Church, but three articles have been so much discussed in recent years that some statements respecting them may be pardoned. All Church history records the constantly recurring fact that the attention of Christian thought concentrates itself upon certain articles of the Christian Creed, and these then pass into obscurity from public gaze, often with new illumination cast upon their meaning.

Born of the Virgin Mary

An illustration of the growth and subsequent defence of Christian creeds is afforded in Dr. Westcott's *The Historic Faith*. These creeds had their origin in the need for definite statements in explanation of Christian Faith. When Dr. Westcott wrote forty years ago the doctrine of the Incarnation, the divine origin of Jesus Christ, was prominent in men's minds. He, therefore, with intended emphasis dwells upon this article and passes over with little more than casual notice the Virgin Birth, only setting it down as an essential of the Creed that "when the fullness of time was come God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law." The fact of the Incarnation but not the mode was the thing then in the forefront of Christian thought. In our own time it has been contended by those who profess belief in

the Incarnation that the added fact of the Virgin Birth is not essential to its completeness. Hence the recent discussion upon the words "Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." These words cannot be altered because they represent the faith of the Catholic Church throughout its whole life. The Church is called upon to defend each article of its creed as changing emphasis causes it to be prominent, and our own day calls us to define and defend what is a necessary part of its full faith.

The Resurrection of the Dead

The teaching in the Church of England on the mode of the Resurrection was governed for long years by the words of Bishop Pearson (1612–86), *Exposition of the (Apostles') Creed*: "We undertake to show that the bodies of men howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long so ever dead, shall hereafter be re-collected in themselves and united to their own souls."

Against this view Bishop Harvey Goodwin, dedicating his book *The Foundation of the Creed* to his friend Professor Stokes in 1889, protested thus—"The concentration of the dust and ashes into which bodies have been dissolved and the re-uniting them to their own souls so that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived, is not so much an unfair task upon human powers of believing, as the enunciation of a theory which a knowledge of the laws of matter show to be untenable; the theory implies that the particles of matter into which a body has been resolved are reserved in such a manner as to be capable of identification and of being claimed for the soul to which they belong. This is not and cannot be so."

About the same time (1882) Bishop Westcott, in *The Historic Faith*, equally condemned the older interpretation, "We should have been spared many sad

perplexities, many grievous misrepresentations if we had clung to St. Paul's figure of the seed in looking to our future resurrection. "We sow not," he tells us, "that body which shall be." There is thus no question here of the re-gathering of material particles, no encouragement for unsatisfying appeals to God's omnipotence.

Dr. Swete later still, in his last utterance to the Church (1917), *The Life of the World to Come*, has written thus:

> It was commonly thought that God would at the Resurrection bring together all the scattered dust and restore every limb, every feature, even every hair of the head, exactly as it was when the body was committed to the ground. . . . So strong was the Christian tradition on this point that it was maintained even by great writers and saints—by so great a scholar as Jerome, and towards the end of his life by so great a teacher and saint as Augustine. One brilliant exception there was, the great and fearless Origen. He put his finger on the answer which had all the while been written plainly enough in the Epistles of St. Paul and from him the Modern Church has learnt how to interpret this article of the ancient Creed.

Like Dr. Westcott he urges that we should be contented with the illustration of analogy which St. Paul uses from nature. It may be added, which our Lord also used when certain Greeks desired to see Him.

Now an analogy is an illustration of two like things common to the subjects illustrated, and the illustration is adduced for this and nothing more. In respects other than the one illustrated they may differ. With this view in mind we shall not raise the question of the presence in the grain of wheat of a germ of life out of which the new life springs. We take St. Paul to be offering only an analogy from what is happening every year and under the eyes of all who will look and consider. In the cornfields there is death before new life can rise. The outer wrappings of the seed perish, but out

of their death issues the life of the new plant. We can accept the analogy of the dying grain of wheat without pressing the correspondence of the germ of life it contains to the dead human body which is buried. The same experience attends the races of men. They pass to life through death. That which is committed to the ground passes into decay and mingles with its parent earth, and this is a condition of the passage of the living self from the life of earth to another life, higher and greater than this, in which personality is preserved, and defined for each individual by the promise of another body so that as we have borne the earthly we shall also bear the heavenly. When we ask for more details of such body we are bid to remember that even in our present experience all flesh is not the same flesh. Here is infinite variety of form and of adaptation to surroundings—birds to fly, fishes to swim, beasts to walk, and reptiles to creep. We are invited to rest satisfied with the contemplation of this unlimited power and to expect in due time to be clothed upon and not unclothed. This body of our humiliation shall be changed into a glorious body according to the mighty working whereby God is able to subdue all things to Himself.

Such appears to be allowable teaching in the Church of England. The question whether we enter at the moment of death upon any portion of our new inheritance of a spiritual body can be treated as a separate fact. As we have no experience of spirit apart from body we can say nothing about pure spirit life. Our only sure conception of a spiritual body is obtained by contemplating the risen body of Christ. Whatever conception we form of an intermediate state must be conditioned by the one all-important event of a time of judgement, at which we must give an account of all the deeds done in the body.

Dr. Swete in the book already quoted says (p. 109): "Of the life of the soul in the interval between death

and resurrection we know comparatively little. . . . He vouchsafes His spiritual presence to the faithful departed after a manner of which we have but frail experience here ; they are 'at home with the Lord,' they are 'with Christ, which is very far better' than life on earth can be. And to be with Him in this fuller sense, must surely be to be purged from the remainder of all earthly imperfections, to grow more and more prepared for the final life of the Resurrection which they still await."

The Faithful Departed

One other question is emerging from the discussions on doctrine now taking place, viz. the relations between the living and those who have passed beyond the veil.

The Anglican Communion whilst denying "the Romish doctrine of Purgatory" has never rejected prayers for the departed, though for long years these have been expunged from her public services and only timidly used in private by the faithful.

The dread calamities of the Great War forced the subject into prominence, and now petitions based upon the limitations of the earliest Christian days are proposed for insertion in the revised Book of Common Prayer, and we can think of those we have lost as living and progressing in knowledge and holiness.

Whilst the subject does not enter into the "Appeal" we are considering, the same Lambeth Conference which issued the "Appeal" has spoken thus (p. 121) in one of its Reports: "The Christian Faith declares that the life in Christ after death is an advance towards a more perfect fellowship with God for those who have been seekers after God and have not alienated themselves from fellowship with Him"; again, "in its doctrine of the Communion of Saints the Church insists that we can and do have communion with the departed through the love of God which is in Christ Jesus.

The mediation of Christ is the only medium which we recognise as the means by which we approach God, and it follows that all who strive and use the means to live in Christ are united to one another in Him—'neither death nor life' can separate them. We are content to leave in His hands all who have passed from our life here, knowing that our communion with them through Him is intensely real."

These three illustrations are inserted because everywhere in negotiations for union the question of the interpretation of adopted formulae is raised. A united Church would make arrangements for its own official interpretation of doctrine, and individuals would be left at liberty as now to study for themselves and to announce their own conclusions. These latter would always be subject to correction and for certainty we can only surrender ourselves to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, under the twofold condition of the Bible interpreted by the Church, and the doctrines of the Church corroborated by the written testimony of Scripture. The craving for infallibility, whilst it can be satisfied by an entire dependence upon the Holy Spirit, must take account of God's ways of leading us into truth which have been well expressed thus: "Conviction of truth grows by contributions from many sources, from the testimony of the past, from personal experience, from spiritual instruction, from conscientious following of the light, from the influences exercised on us by our fellowmen who are eminent for goodness. It never ceases to grow so long as we are faithful to what we have attained."[1]

The Orthodox Eastern Church

Friendly negotiations have proceeded for long years between the Anglican Communion and the Church of the East, and intercommunion has been

[1] *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1889.

established in many parts of the British Empire and elsewhere. The visit of the special delegation from the Œcumenical Patriarchate to the Lambeth Conference in 1920 has caused a great advance towards the goal of ultimate re-union. The work is now being carried on by the Eastern Churches Committee in London, and what the Lambeth Conference Report said about removing Oriental misconceptions to make it clear from our formularies that we regard Ordination as conferring grace and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office, has been accomplished. It will be understood that complete re-union is complicated by numerous difficulties, but short of this the most remarkable progress towards mutual understanding and full confidence is being made on both sides. A Greek archbishop with the titular rank of Metropolitan of Thyatira has been sent to reside in London in order that the negotiations may be conducted "not by the old, dry scholastic method alone, but by living intercourse." Speaking recently, the Metropolitan has said: "The Anglican and old Catholic Churches are recognised by us as having kept the faith, while Rome has distorted Catholicity. I do not belong to those who think that the way has yet been so paved that there remains but one step to full re-union. Long ages of separation require long efforts for healing. *Oremus et Laboremus.*"

The Patriarch of Constantinople has issued to the Presidents of the Holy Orthodox Churches of the East the following important conclusions arrived at by the Church of Constantinople:

1. That the ordination of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury by four bishops is a fact established by history.
2. That in this ordination and those subsequent to it there are found in their fullness those Orthodox and indispensable visible and sensible elements of valid Episcopal Ordination—namely, the Laying-on of Hands and

the *Epiklesis* of the All-Holy Spirit, and also the purpose to transmit the *charisma* of the Episcopal Ministry.

3. That the Orthodox theologians who have scientifically examined the question have almost unanimously come to the same conclusion and have expressed themselves as accepting the validity of Anglican Ordinations.

4. That the practice in the Church affords no indication that the Orthodox Church has ever officially treated the validity of Anglican Orders as in doubt in such a way as would point to the re-ordination of the Anglican clergy being regarded as required in the case of the union of the two Churches.

5. That expressing this general mind of the Orthodox Church the most Holy Patriarchs at different periods, and other hierarchs of the East, when writing to the Archbishops of the Anglican Church, have been used to address them as "Most Reverend Brother in Christ," thus giving them a brotherly salutation.

Our Holy Synod, therefore, came to an opinion accepting the validity of the Anglican priesthood, and has decided that its conclusion should be announced to the other Holy Orthodox Churches in order that occasion might be given them also to express their opinion, so that the mind of the Orthodox world on this important question might be known.

The Swedish Church

The reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden to the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, says: "We accept with fraternal confidence the outstretched hand. We rejoice at the decision of the Anglican Bishops, and on our side we approve of the practice that members of the Anglican Communion, qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in our Church, as well as that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Anglican ecclesiastics to give addresses in our Churches and there to perform

religious functions." On the subject of the Diaconate and Confirmation they say:

(*a*) "In our Church we do not now possess any Order exactly corresponding to the Anglican Diaconate. For a number of years, however, we have had among us a male Diaconate for the service of charity among the sick, the infirm, the poor, the lost, thus of the same character as the Diaconate of women which is older and more amply developed among us. . . . No need of or wish for a Diaconate as an introduction to the ministry has been expressed in our Church."

(*b*) "The question about laying on of hands in Confirmation has, in our opinion, decidedly the character of an *adiaphoron* (a thing of indifference). Consequently we have no scruples against the use of this beautiful rite, which is practised in our Church on other occasions; on the other hand, we cannot accept it if supported by arguments that would in any way question its character of an *adiaphoron*."

On September 19, 1920, two English Bishops took part in the consecration of Swedish Bishops at Upsala, and if an invitation were addressed to the Swedish Church to assist in the consecration of an Anglican Bishop this would be accepted.

The mutual recognition of Orders is now therefore completed.

On the question of doctrine the Swedish Bishops insist upon two things—(1) the recognition of Scripture as *norma normans* both with regard to life and doctrine, and (2) the building of our salvation on God's grace alone received by faith.

"Between God and the soul, or which is the same to us, between Christ and the faith, nothing, no third principle, no institution, no law, no proper works must intervene."

They then add that, so far as they understand the VIth, XIth, XIIth, and XIIIth of our XXXIX.

Articles, these same doctrines are held by the Anglican Church.

India

As another illustration I give from the Mission-fields of India a picture of what is happening there. So long ago as 1919, a movement was started in South India for the establishment of an Autonomous Church which should be independent of State control, and neither a branch of the Church of England nor of any Church foreign to the soil of India.

The negotiations are not yet ended, but we know the principles upon which they are proceeding.

On the subject of doctrine the first three clauses of what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral are adopted.

It is thus agreed to accept a historic and constitutional Episcopate which shall secure that the continuity with the historic Episcopate is effectively maintained. With these safeguards Episcopacy is accepted for the future as a basis of unity without raising other questions respecting it.

After union all future ordinations to the Presbyterate will be performed by laying on of hands by the Bishop and Presbyters, and the consecration of Bishops will be performed by Bishops, not less than three taking part in each consecration.

The United Church in India is to be free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or Society outside of India.

Confirmation, as it is understood in the Anglican Church, may be administered by any of the Bishops of the United Church in any congregation which desires it. In other cases, the service of admission to full membership now in use in the South India United Church, which is a federation of Presbyterian and Congregational Missions, or some similar service shall be employed, and persons who have been admitted

according to this method will be admitted to Holy Communion throughout the Church.

It is further proposed that arrangements be made for those ministers of the uniting Churches who were ordained before the union and are working in either Church at the time of union.

Any such minister shall be at liberty to ask of the Bishops of the Church in the area affected by the union a fresh commission such as would have enabled him to minister in the Church to which he did not belong before the union.

All ministers working in either Church at the time of union, together with those subsequently ordained in the Church after union, shall form the ministry of the Church in the said area.

It will be seen from this that, after securing Episcopal Ordination for every one admitted after the union, the transitional period is met by recognising all existing ministers, with the added permission for any one to receive a fresh commission which, for those not previously Episcopally ordained, will require such ordination.

We must bear in mind that these proposals do not apply to the whole of India, but are confined to the Mission-fields of South India, where alone at present the union is contemplated.

The Latin Communion

We come lastly to the Church of Rome. The Lambeth Conference, 1920, true to its ideal of a United Church, has offered no obstacle to the discussion of union with the Latin Communion, but its language herein is rightly guarded and restrained. It passed no Resolution on the subject, but referred to the question in the Committee's Report to the Conference.

The words to which we refer are these :

Your Committee feels that it is impossible to make any report on re-union with Episcopal Churches without some reference to the Church of Rome even though it has no resolution to propose on the subject. We cannot do better than make our own the words of the Report of 1908, which reminds us of "the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of re-union which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West with which our history has been so closely associated in the past and to which we are still bound by so many ties of common faith and tradition." "But we realise that"—to continue the quotation—"any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created and we cannot of ourselves remove." Then follow these words—"Should, however, the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of re-union we shall be ready to welcome such discussions."

It is difficult to see how anything more than this could have been said. Whilst Churches of other Communions were anxious to discuss terms of difference between us and themselves, there was no such desire officially expressed by the Church of Rome.

Shortly before the Conference was held, a book styled *The Problem of Re-union* appeared in England, and its obvious reference to the questions before the Lambeth Conference was not lost sight of by the Committee or the Conference as a whole. It came from the pen of a former Professor of Stonyhurst, and much in it may be interpreted as of great significance, but it is too personal and too little official to be the subject of any negotiation. The Anglican Communion was not likely to subject itself to the possible inference that in its ill-considered zeal it had started discussions with a private individual whose words could be repudiated by the Church of Rome whenever it deemed such disavowal necessary.

We give the following extract from *The Problem of Re-union* (p. 248), which sounds strange in the ears of students of Church History and witnesses to new methods of conducting old controversies: "Not

all that the Catholic Church inculcates and practises falls under the head of revealed truth and implies the exercise of infallibility, and it is thus with many matters that are in dispute between Catholics and Protestants: celibacy, for instance, communion in one kind, the use of a dead language in her liturgy, abstinence, fasting, the question of extempore prayer, lay preachers, lay representatives in Synods and Councils, lay management of the temporal affairs of a parish, the advisability of granting to the laity a voice in choosing the pastors. In questions such as these, where faith is not directly involved, the practice of the Church has varied in the past and still varies in different places. There is neither any need for uniformity nor is it always desirable, seeing that nations and races differ considerably in their mentality and habits. Each question must be decided on its merits, and as a matter of fact has been decided on its merits, with a view to promoting efficiency and devotion in God's service in each particular age and province."

Side by side with all this stands the contention (p. 254) that there is one and one only "Fold of Christ," and that those who do not bow to the authority of the Church of Rome stand outside.

" Meanwhile the separated Churches will still lie outside the Fold of Christ, and their members, striving ever to recover what they lack from time to time, will discover the true solution. Realising the truth, they will have no right to remain where they are."

This would appear to be an appeal to a small section of the Church of England which adopts the phraseology of the Roman Church, incorporates parts of its worship with the liturgy of our Church, and then pleads its own conscience against the laws and usage required by authority.

The negotiations so far conducted have proceeded upon the assumption that conduct such as this is alien to the mind and intention of the English Church. A

United Church would determine its own discipline and administer this with promptitude and efficiency, and except upon this understanding the ideal of union would be abandoned officially by all parties to the negotiations.

In the willingness to accept Episcopacy which has been stated so far, we may assume there is no approximation to the further condition that the Episcopate and the Church itself must have a common head. Feeling as we do that the negotiations for union are in some quarters being impeded by suspicions, we cannot do better than reiterate things said long ago by Laud in his Conference with Fisher, by Jeremy Taylor in his *Dissuasive from Popery*, and by Isaac Barrow in his *The Pope's Supremacy*. To sum up the joint conclusions of these writers we find a twentieth-century voice speaking their conclusions in tones of gentleness and firmness which conceal no essential facts and yet provoke no possible bitterness.

Dr. Swete in his *The Holy Catholic Church*, written in 1915, writes : " The Pope, it is claimed, as successor to Peter and the true and legitimate Vicar of Christ, presides over the Universal Church, the father and governor of all the faithful.[1] No equally short proposition ever bristled with a greater number of contentious points. It assumes in the first place that our Lord appointed a vicariate on earth over and above that of the Paraclete, who was sent in His name, and that He made Peter His first Vicar with the power of transmitting the office to his successors. It assumes, further, that the Bishops of Rome are the successors of Peter not only in the Episcopate but in the vicariate, and are thus governors of the whole Church on earth. To us Anglicans the first of these assumptions appears to rest on a false exegesis and the second on a historical fiction." Again (p. 22), " Re-union with Rome on the basis of an acceptance of the Papal pretentions is

[1] *Catech. Rom.* ii. VII. 25.

neither possible nor to be desired. It is the will of the True Pastor of the Universal Church that His flock shall be one, but He does not require that it shall be included in a single fold. Each national Church is left free to mould in non-essentials the particulars of worship and discipline in such wise as experience shows to be most edifying to the faithful within its limits. So this latent independence is not only permissible but salutary, and is no detriment to catholic unity."

APPENDIX

EXTRACTS FROM THE CHARGES OF THE LATE BISHOP JAYNE

1. AURICULAR CONFESSION.
2. FASTING COMMUNION.
3. RESERVATION.
4. THE WAFER.
5. THE PRIMITIVE MODE OF CELEBRATION.
6. INCENSE.

APPENDIX

EXTRACTS from *Anglican Pronouncements*, edited by the Right Rev. Francis John Jayne, D.D., Bishop of Chester, 1889–1919 (Phillipson and Golder, Chester), and from the Bishop's own charges and pastoral letters.

(The late Bishop Jayne had a keen solicitude for the maintenance of Anglican principles in their integrity, and was eminently qualified by his sound scholarship and balance of mind to give guidance to others on a loyal adherence to the *Via Media*. In addressing the churchpeople of his diocese on such matters the Bishop's practice was to call attention as well to the formularies of the Church as to the pronouncements of representative divines. His own personal utterances were always framed with deliberate thoughtfulness and expressed in clear and cogent language, but he never cared to repeat in words of his own what had already been well said by others whose names would carry weight. The consequence is that, though in his *Anglican Pronouncements* we are made acquainted very explicitly with the Bishop's personal opinions, the booklet is of additional value as a repertory of declarations on Anglican doctrine by leaders of the Church from the sixteenth century down to the present day.

It was Bishop Jayne's express wish that there should be no memorial of him, and he left nothing for posthumous publication. Permission has, however, been given for the reprinting for the purposes of this volume of select portions of his charges as well as of the booklet referred to.

The extracts are brought together under a succession of headings, the *Anglican Pronouncements* [under the two first headings] being preceded by the Bishop's introductory observations.)

1. AURICULAR CONFESSION

As regards Auricular Confession in its technical, systematic, "sacramental" form, which is to be found at its best and its worst in the Church of Rome, I follow Bishop Ridding, late of Southwell, when he "feels and says most strongly that there is no one of the mediaeval developments which he believes to be so deadly, both to priest and people, as the system included in the confessional." With him, too, I hold that "the evidence of history shows that the system, as tried by the mediaeval western and modern Church, has been a failure." History constrains us to recognise "the impracticable evils of the system of private confession recorded in centuries of Councils and Popes' ordinances, and their vain attempts either to enforce it or remedy its faults. Apart from the moral dangers, which form a chief subject of those ordinances, there are other evils —unreality in particular—which are also officially recorded, and which human nature makes inherent in the secrecy and superstition of the confessional. Historical truth has been violated in the advocacy of its revival in the English Church."

With Archbishop Benson I should say, "as to the confessional—the Culture, the Philosophy, the Science, the Family Union, the Civil Progress that Christendom has brought forth, all alike exclaim :

'*In nostros fabricata est machina muros.*'"

Further, I believe that the system has no fair foothold whatever in the New Testament ; that the texts appealed to, especially John xx. 23, are misinterpreted ; that it is radically at variance with the method and spirit of our Lord and His Apostles in dealing with the souls of men and women. To turn, for example, from Latham's *Pastor Pastorum* to Roman or Romanising books is to enter an essentially different moral and spiritual atmosphere.

Throughout this pamphlet there is but slight reference to the darker side of the confessional. The line taken is on that "higher ground" to which Archbishop Trench directs his clergy and others in words following the passage given by Bishop Dowden :

"In resisting the attempts to give to it [the practice of Confession] a wider scope, we only weaken our position when we dwell mainly on the abuses to which it has sometimes given

occasion. We may fitly take higher ground. Let us assume it to be conducted ever so prudently and well, with the skill and discretion which can be the portion only of a very few, yet even so it could only become the rule among us at the sacrifice of that true manliness of Christian character for which nothing else would be a compensation. We may lean on men till we have unlearned how to go alone, or rather how to lean on Him who is Man and God in one, and who only can truly support and sustain. Moreover, as it presents itself to me, the scheme is imperfect, can only be most imperfectly carried out, even on its own principles. All distinct motions of sin, embodying themselves in thought, in word, or in deed, these it might be just possible to confess—sins, that is—but sin, that dark background of evil out of which the separate sins start into life, how is it possible to fashion this in words, to utter this in any intelligible language to any other but to God, while even to Him, if I may venture on the seeming contradiction, only in groanings which cannot be uttered ? "

(The quotation which follows is from a charge of Bishop Moberly. All references are given in the booklet, to which the reader may turn for fuller particulars.)

" I most thankfully believe that ever since the blessed Breath of the Lord was breathed upon the Apostles, and the sacred words of priestly delegation spoken to them, as recorded in the 20th chapter of St. John's Gospel, the Apostles as a Body, and that a Body to continue by perpetual succession even unto the very end of the world, did receive and do continue to possess the awful power then communicated to them ; and I do also most thankfully believe that besides other indispensable ways in which this sacred power is to be exercised, it is effectual to the relief of the burthened conscience of individual people so that if they under the pressure of heavy distress of sin either publicly known and causing scandal, or secretly weighing down their own souls, desire to unfold their trouble to a priest, it is part of his office to assure them by authoritative sentence of the pardon of God in Christ, and to restore to them that access to His mercy, which was, or seemed to be barred against them.

" But two essential conditions are required in regard to the due exercise of this power : the one, that it be used as remedial only, supplementary, and restorative of the real and true access to God in Christ which is the right of every Christian who has been baptized into the Body, and so into the Sonship of his Lord; and the other that it be exercised not as of separate

and personal right and authority by the single priest, but under the orderly, recognised, and sufficient authorisation of the Church which gives to that priest his commission. The former of these conditions is based upon the undeniable fact, —undeniable alike on grounds of Scripture, and primitive Church History, that the normal and rightful position of a Christian towards God is one of the freest and most unimpeded filial access and address. He needs, no doubt, various acts of external ministration from men in the Church, first to put him and afterwards to help to keep him rightly and well in his estate of high Christian privilege ; but in regard to his secret soul and conscience he is free to go to God without other mediator or help than the Holy Spirit moving him to secret confession and prayer, and to be assured that as the one Paraclete moves him and helps him to pray, so the other Paraclete by the Father's right hand presents his prayers, making them effectual by the virtue of His own propitiatory Sacrifice. And the second of these conditions is based upon the very nature and history of the power itself. It was given to a Body, not to individuals. Even at the first gift, one of the Eleven was absent, and yet we do not doubt that St. Thomas shared it not less than any other of the Apostolic company. The power is in the Body. The organs for its exercise are, no doubt, the individual priests ; but it is not their own separate and independent property, to use as they think proper, and when they think proper, nor to use at all except so far as the Body which gave them commission gives them also the authority to use it, and directions for the use of it.

" There can be no doubt that within a few years the practice of Auricular Confession, and that, not occasional, remedial, and restorative, as I have described it, but habitual, periodical, and regular, has gained great ground in our Church. It is preached far and wide among us as a means of ordinary grace, as a necessary condition of attaining high spiritual life. To such an extent is it carried that I have seen a manual, intended for the use of children, in which they are taught that they cannot be forgiven for even their childish sins without resort to the priest ; though even the Lateran Council which first decreed the necessity of private confession and absolution confined it to the case of adults. It is preached as a matter of so necessary importance that neither remission of sins, nor, by consequence, fitness for Holy Communion, is to be looked for without it."

(Bishop Jayne quoted the above at length as expressing in precise language what he believed to be the mind of the Anglican Church on Auricular Confession. He followed it up by printing in full an "Address to the Clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh," delivered by Bishop John Dowden in 1905.

Bishop Dowden in this Address gives a catena of extracts from representative Anglican divines in the same sense as Bishop Moberly's pronouncement. The authors quoted are such as Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, Andrewes, Hall, Chillingworth, Usher, Sanderson, Hammond, Cosin, Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Burnet, Pusey, Christopher Wordsworth, Trench, Samuel Wilberforce, John Wordsworth, Creighton, Benson, Body, and Gott.

The following declaration as introduced by Bishop Dowden is deserving of special attention.)

"Of greater authority than any utterances of individuals is the declaration of one hundred Bishops, assembled together in conference in the palace of Lambeth in the year 1878. It is a declaration of such weight that I shall here transcribe its leading pronouncements.

> 'In the matter of Confession, the Churches of the Anglican Communion hold fast those principles which are set forth in the Holy Scriptures, which were professed by the Primitive Church, and which were re-affirmed at the English Reformation; and it is their [the Bishops'] deliberate opinion that no minister of the Church is authorised to require from those who may resort to him to open their grief, a particular or detailed enumeration of all their sins; or to require private confession previous to receiving the Holy Communion; or to enjoin, or even encourage, the practice of habitual confession to a priest; or to teach that such practice of habitual teaching, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life.' To this, however, is added the statement that the assembled Bishops 'are not to be understood as desiring to limit in any way the provision made in the Book of Common Prayer for the relief of troubled consciences.'

"This declaration was drawn up by a committee specially appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the subject, and was adopted, and 'commended to the faithful,' by the whole conference of one hundred Bishops."

2. FASTING COMMUNION

In preparing the Report of the Upper House of the Convocation of York upon this subject I had the privilege of being associated with Bishop Westcott, who was deeply interested in the question and did most of the drafting. In order to show the substantial agreement between the two Upper Houses, we included extracts from the Canterbury Report, and also the *gravamen* which occasioned it and gave the mind of the Lower House of that Convocation. The names of those who signed the *gravamen* witness to a strength and breadth of feeling quite beyond party.

Fasting Communion as a devotional observance edifying for one's self can meet only with respect and sympathy, though even sympathy may urge some attention to the voice of common sense. "Mr. and Mrs. Keble were very stern at anything which seemed to them foolish, and their tone of marked disapproval on hearing of a delicate girl insisting on going to an early Celebration against advice made a great impression, and the grave voice in which they said, 'it is not even common sense.'" But to exalt it into a Rule binding upon the Christian conscience generally is a different and no trifling matter. The Church of England has no such Rule, and, as is remarked by Dean Strong (*infra*, p. 65), it is undesirable that it should make precise rules of the kind. It would thus become involved in a lower ideal. The basis of authority on which this Rule is supposed to rest has no solidity, and the plea of reverence for the Sacrament which is put forward is, on probing, found to be inseparable from materialistic notions. If these are admitted —to say nothing of graver objections to them—they will apply, as the York Report points out (p. 62), to taking food after, at least as much as to taking food before, reception. It is indeed difficult to reconcile such notions with our Lord's teaching and the circumstances under which He instituted His Supper. An early writer perceived that to condemn communion after food is, ultimately, to condemn Christ Himself.

Report of the Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of York on the Fasting Reception of the Holy Communion. Adopted unanimously by the House, May 4, 1899.

"Our attention has been called to the teaching of various Manuals of Instruction and Devotion which are widely circu-

lated among members of our Church, and to special pastoral directions, in which Fasting Reception is made one of the things 'required of them who come to the Lord's Supper,' though it is not included in the requirements set out in the Catechism, and nowhere enjoined in the Prayer Book or in any authoritative document of our Church.

"We are very far from desiring to lessen in any degree the devout reverence with which the Sacrament of Holy Communion ought to be approached; or to discourage Fasting Reception where it is found to provide a salutary self-discipline. We readily acknowledge that a custom which has prevailed from early times throughout the Church generally till the sixteenth century, and which has been advocated as helpful to the spiritual life by many teachers of our own Church, is always likely to find wide acceptance among us. At the same time to describe reception without fasting as a sin is wholly unwarranted by the teaching of Holy Scripture, and is therefore inconsistent with the Ordination Vow. We further hold that there are grave reasons both from the history of the custom and from its essential character against making the practice of Fasting Reception one of obligation.

"1. The circumstances of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist exclude the thought that taking food shortly before disqualifies for Reception. The same conclusion follows from St. Paul's treatment of this Sacrament in 1 Cor. xi. Nor is the obligation of Fasting Reception supported by any authority of Scripture or by any apostolic ordinance. The conjecture of Augustine that it was one of the points which St. Paul 'set in order' (1 Cor. xi. 24) rests on no historical foundation.

"The custom of Fasting Reception would naturally arise when the service was transferred from a late hour of the evening (according to our reckoning) to an early hour of the morning. The cause of this change is not recorded. It may have been made in the Gentile Churches, in which the Jewish reckoning of time was superseded by the Roman, in order to place the service at the beginning of the Roman day, as the institution had been at the beginning of the Jewish day. But not to insist on any special explanation of the origin of the change, it is enough to observe that there is no reason for supposing that it was made in order to secure a fast from the beginning of the day to the time of Communion.

"When the custom of Fasting Reception was once established even in a limited range, it was likely to spread owing to

the general tendency of the Oriental mind towards ascetic practices. But the adoption of the custom was ultimately accompanied by serious evils. Infrequent reception and non-communicating attendance, which cannot be wholly dissociated from Fasting Communion, came to be general; and these customs find no support in the teaching and practice of the Primitive Church.

"2. Fasting, again, is a means to an end and not an end in itself. It is valuable or not according as it fulfils the proposed object. It may be employed to obtain for the communicant the fullest command over his powers of attention and devotion. But it is evident that the fitness of fasting for obtaining this result depends in a large degree upon climate, domestic habits, age, and the like; and exhaustion, as we all know, is itself in most cases fatal to spiritual self-command. And more than this: while the spontaneous combination of prayer and fasting corresponds with a spiritual instinct, it is contrary to the tenor of apostolic teaching, and indeed of the teaching of the Lord Himself, to make the observance of a period of material abstinence a necessary condition of participating in the highest spiritual service of the Church. The inherent discordance between the custom of Fasting Reception and its object becomes still more obvious, if fasting is made obligatory, from a fixed hour, when it is remembered that the duration of the fast and its physical effects will necessarily vary in individual cases, and are practically indeterminate. Nor can it be overlooked that the different conditions of town and country parishes introduce serious difficulties in the uniform application of any such rule. It may be added that so far as Fasting Reception is advocated on the ground of reverence for the Sacrament, the arguments have a wider range. They may be used with equal, and some will think with greater force in favour of fasting after reception.

"Such considerations show that Fasting Reception is one of those matters of Ecclesiastical Discipline which every 'particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish' with a view to the spiritual health of its members. And that the English Church since the Reformation has ceased to require fasting before Holy Communion, leaving the matter to individual liberty,[1] appears to be clear from the fact that

[1] See the Report on Fasting Communion adopted by the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, May 5, 1893. Clause 7. "That at the Reformation the Church of England, in accordance with the principle of liberty laid down in

there is no direction upon the subject in those passages of the Prayer Book in which the requisites of individual preparation are plainly specified, nor in any of our authoritative documents. If it be urged that there was no need to prescribe the observance in 1549, the same cannot be said of 1662.[1] In other words, our Church has virtually applied to this matter the principle of St. Paul's teaching on a similar question : *Let not him that eateth set at nought him that eateth not ; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth ; for God hath received him. . . . Let each man be fully assured in his own mind* (Rom. xiv. 3, 5)."

3. RESERVATION

(From " An Earnest Representation submitted by the Bishop of Chester to his Brethren of the Upper House of the Convocation of York.")

The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1904 was intended to meet a deep and widespread anxiety. The unanimous report of that Commission in 1906, which included the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Paget of Oxford, and the Bishop of Gloucester, though it brought to light a startling amount of " illegal practices of a graver kind," was on the whole reassuring, and the Convocations went to work under the Royal Letters of Business dutifully, in a conciliatory mood, and not unhopefully.

But in 1906 the *English Hymnal* was published, which obviously sought to popularise, as only hymns can do, tendencies one at least of which belonged to the category condemned by the Commission.

The growth of such errors during the last decade has been phenomenal. They confront us under the head of Reservation of the " Holy Eucharist," or to use the common but more doubtful term, " the Blessed Sacrament." [2] In 1906 the Commission

---

Article XXXIV., ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting, though the practice was observed by many as a reverent and ancient custom, and as such is commended by several of her eminent writers and divines down to the present time."

[1] Compare the first Rubric of the Service for Baptism of those of Riper Years, in which Fasting is recommended (1662).

[2] I submit that before we adopt the phrase into Anglican, and especially Episcopal phraseology, we look more closely into its genesis and associations. And, again, ought we to let the Prayer Book phrase " Administration of the Holy Communion " be so commonly supplanted by " Celebration," a subordinate Prayer Book term which, as things now are, lends itself too readily to " Celebratio missae " ? (See *Hort's Life*, ii. 342.)

reported that this practice obtained certainly in 13, probably in 17 churches; while "in addition to the above there were a considerable number of churches in which there were or seemed to be tabernacles, but there was no evidence of reservation" (Report, p. 37). In 10 years' time nearly 1000 clergy of the Province of Canterbury claimed, as a right, reservation for purposes *extra usum Sacramenti*, and we can hardly hope that the Province of York, if examined, would not increase the total.

May I remind you of the History of Reservation, of which something is said in the Report (p. 39). A fuller account will be found in Bingham's *Ecclesiastical Antiquities* (vol. v. pp. 379-397), Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica* (pp. 789-803), and *A Catholic Dictionary* (4th edition, p. 785), (article, "Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament," which for reservation in *modern* times refers to Articles "Benediction," "Exposition," and "Visits to the Blessed Sacrament"). This Roman Catholic authority in the main article gives a summary, which differs little from the fuller accounts of the Anglican Divines.

The New Testament is silent on the subject. We start from the well-known passage in Justin Martyr which tells how the deacons took the consecrated elements to the sick and absent members generally, while the Holy Communion was being administered. How far can this be correctly termed Reservation? However, Persecution and Captivity naturally called for such arrangements. The Eucharist was also sent as a token of Christian fellowship from bishop to bishop. It was sometimes carried home, for private uses, and St. Augustine gives an instance of its healing virtue. "St. Augustine, in the last year of his life, 430, says that one Acatius, whom he had known, asserted that having been born blind, he had acquired sight when about five years old, through the application of a 'poultice made out of the Eucharist.' This seems to imply that his mother, who applied it, had the Sacrament at home." Scudamore, p. 793.

The Sacrament was also used for protection on a journey. "It was carried by lay persons, or even catechumens (see Ambros. *De Excid. Sat.* i. 43), as a protection against danger. This custom must have lasted, at least in the case of clerics, till late in the Middle Ages, for St. Thomas à Becket carried the Eucharist with him when he went to meet Henry II. St. Louis of France carried the Eucharist with him beyond the sea, but by permission of the Papal legate, and from about

this time the privilege seems to have been reserved to the Pope, though one or two instances of priests carrying it for their own protection occur in later times—*e.g.* in the life of Savonarola. Among the Greek monks it was still maintained when Arcudius wrote his work *De Concordia Eccl. Occid. et Orientalis in VII Sacramentorum administratione*—*i.e.* in the seventeenth century. In Rome and France, as appears from the Ordo Romanus and Alcuin, a bishop at his consecration kept a part of the Host presented to him by the consecrator and consumed it during the next forty days. The same usage obtained in some parts of France at the ordination of priests. Many councils reprove the custom, which must have been widely spread, of giving communion to the dead (Concil. Hippo. c. 4; Auxerre, c. 12; Statut. Bonifac. 20). The Host was buried with the dead. The pen was sometimes dipped in the Communion under the species of wine in subscribing decrees of councils, etc. Pope Theodore, for example, signed the condemnation of Pyrrhus in this way. In dedicating churches three portions of the Host were put in the altar and sealed up with cement" (from *A Catholic Dictionary*, which also gives information about "The Case or Tabernacle, and also the Place in which The Blessed Sacrament was reserved").

Reviewing these instances of primitive reservation, some of them will seem to us natural and even necessary for the times: some simple and naïve, though perilous, as on the high road to superstition: several were formally condemned, or fell out of use after running their course, and all but reservation for the sick, and for worship and adoration disappeared as the dogma of Transubstantiation was formulated: when it could be authoritatively stated as by *A Catholic Dictionary* (sub "Eucharist"): "Catholics pay to the Eucharist, present on the altar, reserved in the tabernacle or carried in procession—to the Eucharist, in short, wherever it may be present—that supreme worship which is due to God alone." Is not the Roman Catholic priest in some quarters popularly said to "make God"?

How this teaching differs from that of "The English Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries" is shown by A. W. Haddan in the essay I have already referred to. "They (*i.e.* the Divines of sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) firmly denied any local and material presence within the elements and not in order to participation (*extra usum sacramenti*). . . . If, indeed, the word 'objective,' which is now pressed upon

us, means only what its original introducer intended by it, viz. that the Presence comes from the act of GOD without us, and not from our own mental state, undoubtedly it is not only innocent, but indicates an essential truth. . . . In a word then, the view for which we are to stultify the whole past of the English Church is a gratuitous view, as meeting no difficulty and answering no purpose ; it is a view based mainly upon logical principles unduly pressed ; *and it is inconsistent with the cardinal doctrine of the Ascension.*"

And Bishop Dowden, so eminent in liturgiology, bears like witness in his letters to the *Guardian* (1900), followed by his illuminating *Define your terms*, from which (p. 21) I have extracted this and other passages : " One thing is absolutely certain. It is no part of the doctrine of our Church that there is an adorable presence of our LORD's body and blood *in* and *under* the forms of bread and wine. Such language is undiscoverable in the doctrinal standards of our Church, and wholly unknown to the Church of the early Fathers."

At all events, however this question as to the root of our present troubles may be determined, we are now in vital conflict with practices (including the recrudescence of " the Mass " and all that it involves) to which the epithet idolatrous must be applied. Bishop Bull and Mr. Scudamore more than justify the statement.

Sir Robert Phillimore, whose distinction as an ecclesiastical judge and strong personal Churchmanship are well known, in Martin *v.* Mackonochie, dealing with the ceremony of Elevation, refers to Bull as one of the greatest Divines of our Church. He quotes a portion of his answer to Bossuet, who had expressed his surprise that he was not a Romanist as well as a Catholic :

" Besides, the whole administration of the Eucharist is so clogged, so metaphorised and defaced by the addition of a multitude of ceremonies, and those some of them more becoming the stage than the table of our Lord, that if the blessed apostles were alive, and present at the celebration of the mass in the Roman Church, they would be amazed, and wonder what the meaning of it was ; sure I am, they would never own it to be that same ordinance which they left to the Churches.

" But the worst ceremony of all is the elevation of the Host, to be adored by the people, as very Christ himself under the appearance of bread, whole Christ, Θεάνθρωπος, *God and man*, while they neglect the old *sursum corda*, the lifting up

of their hearts to heaven, where whole Christ indeed is. A practice this is, which nothing can excuse from the grossest idolatry, but their gross stupidity, or rather infatuation, in thinking that a piece of bread can, by any means, whatsoever, or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. A very sad excuse indeed. Moreover, by what reason, by what Scripture, by what example or practice of the primitive Churches, can the Romanists defend their carrying about the holy sacrament in procession, or the mockery of their solitary masses ? "

I look with hope to the rising generation of loyal and central Churchmen who are more and more endeavouring to meet error with truth, overbold assertion with solid, sober learning. They have a hard task, for the sensuous, the material, and the external in religion have always had a powerful fascination for too many minds ; but we know that in the long run truth must prevail. This is the form of " discipline " which I most trust, and I would illustrate my meaning from F. D. Maurice's *Life and Writings*, ii. 627 ; see also 590 and 614. He was referring to the coercive and repressive measures to which, in the Bennett and other prosecutions, men were, he thought, trusting too much as a remedy : " The whole subject has, it seems to me, been strangely misrepresented. The Ritualists say that, at all events, they are magnifying the Eucharist, and that for this merit we ought to overlook what appear to us, though not to them, trivialities. That claim appears to be conceded by their opponents. They scandalise me by practically and habitually denying what I have always regarded as the glory of the Eucharist, that it testifies of a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, which has been once made for the sins of the whole world ; that it testifies that there is an access by the Spirit through the ascended CHRIST to the FATHER. Their attempt to bring CHRIST back to the altar seems to me the most flagrant denial of the Ascension, and therefore of the whole faith of Christendom, that can be imagined. We give up everything to them if we charge them with an excess of belief : the complaint should be of their unbelief. But we are not to punish men for unbelief, but to confess it as an evil to which we are all prone, into which every one of us is continually falling."

4. THE WAFER

(From " A Note from the Bishop upon an Aspect of Ecclesiastical Discipline.")

Of the use of Wafers, Chancellor Talbot says (*Modern Decisions on Ritual*, p. 140): " It is settled as law that pure wheat bread, such as is usually eaten, is the only substance that can legally be used as bread in the holy eucharist." [1] But, apart from the legal aspect of the question, I am convinced that the more impartially the historical and symbolical sides are examined, the weaker will the case for wafers be found. The use has no claim to be primitive. Bingham (*Antiquities of the Christian Church*, vol. v. bk. xv. ch. ii. §§ 5 and 6) shows that " for a thousand years the eucharistical elements were usually taken out of the people's oblations; and consequently that there was no use of wafers or unleavened bread. Further, that the use of wafers instead of bread was condemned in their first original." He says (p. 248) that " now the most wise and learned men in the Roman Church, who have most exactly scanned and examined the matter, think fit to desert the Schoolmen, and maintain that the whole primitive Church, and the Roman Church itself, for many ages never consecrated the eucharist in any other than common and leavened bread." In the division between East and West upon the question about the use of leavened and unleavened bread, " the Western Church," he says, " ran so far into an extreme as almost to lose the nature of the Sacramental element, by introducing a thing that could hardly be called bread, instead of that common staff of life which the LORD had appointed to be the representation of His body in the eucharist " (p. 251). Cardinal Bona, upon whom Bingham, and also Scudamore in his *Notitia Eucharistica*, largely rely, conjectures that the change crept in when the people left off to make the oblations in common bread. " The modern form of the wafer dates from the twelfth century, when it is said to have been adopted instead of the larger cakes formerly used at the Eucharist, because of the paucity of communicants " (Report of Royal Commission, par. 104). Thus the bun-like cake, the shape of which, Scudamore states, has been preserved to this day among the

[1] " Though wafer-bread, pure and without any figure upon it, shall not be forbidden." Cosin desired that these words should be inserted in the Rubric in 1662, but they were rejected. See Talbot, p. 138.—(ED.)

Greeks and Orientals, dwindled down to the shape and size of a denarius or penny. (See quotation from Honorius of Autun (A.D. 1150) in Scudamore, *Ecc. Not.* pp. 746-749.) Passing for a moment to the symbolical side of the matter, Bingham's description of the wafer as a "thing that can hardly be called bread" suggests its unfitness to represent symbolically the living Bread that cometh down from heaven to give life unto the world; and, again, the one bread or loaf, of which St. Paul makes so much in 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of CHRIST? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." "The single loaf," it has been said, "is the symbol and instrument of unity." The *social* aspect of Holy Communion is comparatively lost in the wafer, and it is a great loss.

5. THE PRIMITIVE MODE OF CELEBRATION

(From a Charge delivered November 27, 1902.)

The one holy table or altar stood, as Eusebius describes it, "in the midst," *i.e.* at the centre of the chord of the apse —or sometimes under the dome—reverently railed or vailed around; and from its steps the Bishop and other preachers delivered their sermons, though we hear of St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine preaching from the ambon, that they might be better heard. The Bishop often, if not usually, preached from his *cathedra.* For the celebration the Bishop and clergy advanced to the holy table from their seats, and the service was rendered with that "openness" on which the Lambeth judgement lays stress, remarking "the tenor of the Common Prayer is openness. The work of its framers was to bring out and recover the worship of the Christian congregation, and specially to replace the Eucharist in its character as the Communion of the whole Body of Christ." In illustration of primitive openness I read a quotation from Addis and Arnold's (Roman) *Catholic Dictionary* which (article on 'Altar,' p. 22), says: "After the time of Constantine, when sumptuous churches were erected, careful arrangements were made for the position of the altar. It did not lean, as it often does now, against the sanctuary wall, but stood out with a space round it, so that the Bishop, when celebrating mass, looked towards the people. Thus the altar looked in the same direction as the portals of

the church, and often both were turned towards the east. This ancient arrangement is still exemplified by the 'Papal' altars in the Roman Basilicas, but particularly in St. Peter's, where the Pope still says Mass on the great Festivals, looking at one and the same time to the people, to the portals of the church, and to the east."

The better we come to understand the primitive position of the altar and the celebrant, the less, I think, shall we be inclined to make a shibboleth, one way or the other, of what is known familiarly—"too familiarly," Bishop Stubbs remarks—as the eastward position. The Catholic Church for centuries seems to have known little or nothing of that position, nor yet of the position at the north end. For our own branch of the Church the Lambeth judgement has secured the blessed boon of liberty of choice between those alternatives. But it also says, "the imputed sacrificial aspect of the eastward position is new and forced, and can take no effect in rendering that position either desirable on the one side or illegal on the other."

Here, as always, the truth will make us free, and break down the middle wall of partition which prejudice and misunderstanding run flimsily, but forbiddingly, up between brethren and brethren. Church History is, we know, a cordial for drooping spirits. May it not also give healthy expansion to narrow minds?

In those days standing was the attitude for prayer on Sundays and during the whole period between Easter and Whit Sunday. The 20th Canon of Nicaea reads thus: "Whereas there are some who kneel on the Lord's Day, and even in the Pentecostal days; in order that all observances in every parish, *i.e.* diocese, may be uniform, it has pleased the Holy Synod that the prayers be offered standing." The communicants drew near to the table, and standing beside it, with head meekly bent, received the holy food. "To this day," writes Canon Bright, "communicants in the Eastern Church thus stand, bending forward." The Western Church diverged from that rule, and our own Church at the Reformation in the exercise of its freedom, as laid down in the XXXIVth Article, and with a wise regard for the devotional habits of the people, retained kneeling as the usual attitude for prayer and for receiving the consecrated elements. "In unâ fide nihil officit sanctae ecclesiae consuetudo diversa." There can be little doubt that the intention of the Communion Rubric includes the celebrant. Bishop Cosin desired to place this beyond doubt by altering the Rubric thus:

"Then shall the Priest that celebrateth receive the Holy Communion in both kinds upon his knees." Certainly in primitive days the posture was the same for celebrant and communicants, and, as their name witnesses, for the *Consistentes*, or Co-standers with the communicants.

I must now leave the Basilica, only mentioning that in early days the robes of the clergy were, in all the beauty of Christian symbolism, white.

6. INCENSE

(From a Sermon preached in Chester Cathedral, August 6, 1899.)

My purpose in this Sermon is to suggest some points of view from which we may with advantage study the decision of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York with regard to the liturgical use of incense and the processional use of lights.

1. We shall notice with grateful and dutiful appreciation the considerate care bestowed upon the hearing of the case. The Prayer Book direction simply says: "If the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop." But, under the existing arrangement, the two Archbishops sit together, counsel and experts are heard, and every reasonable opportunity is offered to the Clergy and the laity interested on either side. The ruling or resolution, given after such a patient and thorough hearing, carries with it and claims no coercive powers. But its constraining influence upon the reason, conscience, and action of modest and loyal Churchmen must be powerful indeed. And alike in the method of procedure and the whole tone of the judgement a high example has been set before the people of England of the way in which Christian controversy should be conducted.

2. The Archbishops' decision, that the liturgical or ceremonial use of incense is illegal, is an independent and most weighty confirmation of the unbroken series of opinions and judgements to the same effect. On this subject there has been complete unanimity. Five times by different authorities the question was considered, and five times the censing of persons and things was unhesitatingly pronounced illegal. There was absolutely no dissentient voice. Sir Robert Phillimore's words may be quoted as representing the general conclusion: "The

objection is not taken to the use of incense for the purposes of ornament or fumigation of the church, for which purposes it seems to have been used at various times since the Reformation. . . . But to bring in incense at the beginning of, or during, the celebration, and remove it at its close, appears to me a distinct ceremony additional, and not even indirectly incident, to those ordered by the Prayer Book. The use of it as charged is therefore illegal."

Let me add that those who will refer to such an accessible work as *Procter on the Book of Common Prayer*, and will study on pages 316-18 the elaborate rubrical directions in the *Sarum Missal* for the censing of persons and things, and then note their total disappearance from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. and all the later Reformed Prayer Books, cannot fail to be impressed by the contrast. Is it conceivable that the Clergy of the Reformed Church, deprived of the precise guidance of the abandoned rubrics, were henceforward to be a law to themselves in the liturgical use of incense?

At all events, any lingering shadow of a doubt as to the illegality of the practice has now been dispelled. He must be a singularly self-confident member of the Church of England who refuses to bow to such a consensus of learned and authoritative opinions, and I have a good hope that no such person will be found among either the Clergy or the laity of this Diocese.

But further, it is of the utmost importance to remember that the position of our Reformed Church with regard to the ceremonial use of incense has the clear sanction of the New Testament and the Church of the three first centuries. "There are no footsteps of these things (censers and incense) in the three first ages of the Church," is Bingham's well-known statement (iii. 109).

And this brings me to another highly important point. We have recently had in connection with the Bible references to incense some singularly lax and misleading statements. It has been said, for example, that "the witness of the Bible is strongly in favour of a ceremonial use of incense as symbolising prayer." This statement seems to involve a twofold error. In the first place, if by a ceremonial use of incense is meant the censing of persons and things, it has no support from the Bible, not even from the Old Testament. It must stand, if it is to stand at all, upon much newer and less hallowed ground.

But a second error has to be noticed. It has of late

become customary in certain quarters to speak of "the Church of the Apocalypse" in a seriously misleading way; to assume that the mention of incense in the symbolical visions of the Book of the Revelation is intended "to give the highest Christian sanction to what might otherwise have been looked upon as one of the transient parts of Levitical Ceremonial." It is difficult to say where such a method of interpretation would lead us.

Before we reintroduce incense into the services of our Church, it will be necessary to examine in a more scientific spirit the Bible references to its use, and it may be safely predicted that no warrant will ever be found in the Book of supreme authority for the censing of persons and things. In the meantime, I would suggest for study in connection with the subject St. Paul's teaching in Galatians iv. 3 and 9, and Colossians ii. 20, about the Christian's emancipation from "the rudimentary disciplinary ordinances, whose sphere is the mundane and sensuous." And also verses 1-10 of Hebrews ix., in which the golden censer (or, it may be, the altar of incense) is included among the furniture of the mundane sanctuary, the tabernacle —thus belonging to a system of things which was destined to pass away. The more we ponder these and the like passages the more shall we appreciate the anxiety of the Reformers for a simple and chastened and genuinely primitive symbolism, and the less disposed shall we be to mistake a gorgeous and complicated ritual for that true splendour of worship which God desires and approves.

5. But in claiming for our Church the right to return in this matter of incense to the more excellent way of the primitive Church, we are far from presuming to censure other branches of the Church Catholic in which the liturgical use of incense still obtains. We keep close to those admirable words of our Prayer Book concerning ceremonies: "And in these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only; for we think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error and superstition." This is also the well-known teaching of the XXXIVth Article.

But while we recognise the rights of other Churches and maintain the freedom of our own Communion, let us be on our guard against the well-meant but seriously mistaken notion

that the reunion of Christendom, for which we cannot labour and pray too earnestly, can be promoted by unauthorised and ill-considered attempts to assimilate our worship in detail to the worship of other Communions. Continuity and reunion are noble, vital, vitalising ideas. But let us be sure of this, that the only continuity that is tenable, the only reunion that can be hoped for, is a continuity, a reunion not of minute details but of great main lines. To change the metaphor, if the divided members of Christendom are ever again to be reunited, it must be by their agreeing to drink the water of life where it issues fresh from the pure source of Apostolic and primitive Christianity. We can make—we ought to make —large allowance for those whose taste still inclines them to draw their supplies from the stream where it flows broad but sullied far down the centuries. But it is false charity and shortsighted wisdom on our part to disparage the wholesomer taste which, by God's providence, we have ourselves inherited, to force strange draughts upon the reluctant palates of our own people, and so to stir up fresh strife at home while we are endeavouring to join hands abroad.

6. Finally, let us never forget that sound principles should bind us to consistent practice. Let us therefore take good heed that, from the altar of our hearts and lives, there does indeed rise up continually the true, evangelical incense of prayer and praise, of virtuous and holy living. St. Paul has taught us that kind deeds may be "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God." He bids us "Walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." If we know these things happy are we if we do them.

INDEX

Abelard, 6
Acton, Lord:
  on conscience in thirteenth century, 68
  on Papacy's assassination policy, 96
  on Ultramontane mendacity, 109, 116, 133, 135, 136
"Administration" preferable to "Celebration," 313 *n.* 2
Adolphe Monod's Farewell, 166
Adoration of the Host, the, 144, 146, 150, 157 *n.* 1, 159, 162-163, 184, 315, 316-317
Adrian VI., Pope, 62
Advent Sermons (Liddon), 196
Aegean Sea, historical epoch of, 50, 51
Against Celsus (Origen), 186
Age of the Fathers, The (Bright), 223
Alexander VI., Pope, 61, 71
Alleged Failures of Infallibility (Coupe), 110
Altar, the, its primitive position, 319-320
"Altar," the word, 87, 143, 154; not a truly Catholic term, 185
Althusius, 64
Alzog, Professor, 118-119
Ambrose, St., 84
Ambrosiaster, 84
America:
  effects of discovery of, 47-51, 66
  Roman Catholic newspaper boycott in, 106
Ammonius, 54
Andrewes, Bishop, 61, 145, 157 *n.* 1
Angelus, the, 207
Anglican, the new type of, 267-269
Anglican Church. *See* England, Church of
Anglican Orders, 35; validity of, accepted by Orthodox Church, 294; by Swedish Church, 295
Anglican Pronouncements (Jayne), 305
Anglicanism:
  action and reaction in, 99-100
  reform with continuity in, 60-61, 89-91
Anglo-Catholic movement, the, 145-147, 178, 180, 210-211, 264, 299, 313-314
Angus, husband of Margaret of Scotland, 72
Answer to a Jesuit (Usher), 209, 227, 231
Antiquities of the Christian Church (Bingham), 150, 318
Antoninus Pius, 25
Apocalyptic character of present times, 249-250
Apocrypha, the, 16
Apostles' Creed, the, 17, 29, 165
Apostolic succession, the, 17-18, 307-308
Appeal to All Christian People, An, 29, 165, 166, 273-274
  its proposals, 29-30, 41, 276-277
  results of, 278-279
  the doctrine of the Sacrament and, 29, 165-168
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 82, 112-113, 114
Arcudius, 315
Arezzo, the Virgin of, 214
Aristotle, 25
Arnold, Matthew, 78
Arnold of Brescia, 6-7
Art, Roman Catholic, 213-214
Articles, the Thirty-Nine. *See* Thirty-Nine Articles
Ascended Christ, The (Swete), 152-153
Asceticism, mistake of, 258, 259
Assumption of the Virgin Mary, the, 231-233
Athanasian Creed, the, 286
Athanasius, 253
Atlantic Ocean, historical epoch of, 48, 49, 50, 51

Augustine, St., 319
on Christ's relation to His Mother, 220
on Church and Bible, 16
on the Eucharist, 161-162, 314
on fasting Communion, 311
on God as sole object of worship, 231
on the priesthood of the laity, 79
on the Resurrection of the Dead, 289
on the State authority, 84, 85
on the Virgin Mary's conception, 236
Auricular Confession:
not truly Catholic, 183
Bishop Jayne on, 306-309
Australia, Reunion movement in, 278, 279
Authority:
in religion: individual liberty and, 11-14
Christ the Supreme Authority, 20-23
Church and Bible, 14-20, 40
reason its true basis, 12-14, 23, 25, 40
the State's, Patristic attitude to, 81-86
Averroes, 163

Bacon, 54
Bagehot, Walter, 89
Baltic Sea, historical epoch of, 48, 49, 50
Bampton Lectures, The (Headlam), 278
Baptism, 29; Reformation view of, 90
Barnes, Robert, 73
Barrow, Isaac, 300
Bartholomew, St., massacre of, Gregory XIII. on, 95
Bebel, Heinrich, 54
Becket, Thomas à, 314-315
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 236
Belloc, Hilaire, 105 *n.*, 121, 123 *n.* 1
Benedictine Monasticism (Butler), 107-108
Benediction, the service of, 146
Benson, Archbishop, 149, 306
Bentham, Jeremy, 54
Berkeley, Bishop, 50
Bernard, St., 111, 130; opposed to dogma of Immaculate Conception, 129, 236
Bernard Abbot, St., 203
Bernardinus de Bustis, 206
Bible, the:
the Canon of, 16-17
Christ the Supreme Authority of, 20-23
the Church and, relations of, 14-20, 40, 77, 196, 292
Bible, the (*continued*)—
Church of England needs to study, 196
criticism and interpretation of, modern, 21-22, 40, 262, 264
inspiration of, Reformation view, 90
Reformation based on appeal to, 77-78
Roman Catholic ignorance of, 213
the standard of faith, 29, 41, 277
translations of, 75-78
Bigg, Dr., 159
Bilney, Thomas, 73
Bingham, Joseph, 150, 314, 318, 319, 322
Bishop, Edmund, 151
Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims (Chapman), 123
Black Rubric, the, 144, 162
Blanca, Donna, 72
"Blessed Virgin," title of, 209
Body of Christ, The (Gore), 154 *n.*, 161-162
Bolsena, the miracle of, 163
Bona, Cardinal, 318
Bonaventura, 204-206
Boniface VIII., Pope, 63
Bonner, Bishop, 88
Bossuet, J. B., 65, 224, 316
Bramhall, John, 157 *n.* 1
Brandt, Sebastian, 54
Bread, the Sacramental, its form, 171, 318-319
Bretons at Home, The (Gostling), 210
Breviary, the Roman, 198-199, 202
cultus of the Virgin Mary in, 199, 202-204, 231-232
Bright, Canon, 223, 320
Brinckman, A., 125, 131, 134
Brittany, local Virgins of, 210
Browne, Bishop Harold, 145, 149-150, 216
Bull, Bishop, 145, 208, 223-224, 316
Burke, Edmund, 64, 65, 81
Burkitt, Professor, 162
Butler, Dom Cuthbert, 107-108
Butler, Samuel, 54

Calvin, John, 60, 80
Calvinism in the Reformation, 90
Cambridge University, the Reformation in, 73
Canada, Reunion movement in, 279
Canon of the Scriptures, the, 15, 16-17
Canus, Melchior, 236
Cartwright, Bishop, 60, 67
Casale, 72
Castelli, 93
Cathari, the, 7
Catherine of Aragon, 71

" Catholic," the word, 31, 178, 210
Catholic Dictionary, A, 314, 315, 319-320
Catholic Truth and Historical Truth (Coulton), 134
Catholicity, the formula of, 148, 178
Roman Catholic tenets and usages tested by, 147-152, 182-186
" Celebration," the word, 313 *n.* 2
Celibacy, clerical, Wyclif and, 59
Celsus, 186
Censorship imposed by Roman Catholic Church, 53-54, 63, 106-111, 118-119, 125, 132-133
Chapman, Dom, 123, 124, 125
Charges (Thirlwall), 153
Charles I., 54
Charles V., 65, 71, 72, 92
Chaucer, 100
Chillingworth, William, 15
Christ :
His Authority supreme, 20-23, 24-25, 40-41
the Creeds in relation to, 30-33
His criticism of His own Church, 5, 33
God and, the oneness of, 153, 154, 155, 159, 223, 224, 225
the Incarnation of, 223-224, 287-288
His Kingdom, 4, 5
new knowledge of, 262
as the Divine Logos, 20, 24-25, 40-41
His Mother, His recorded references to, 217-221
His Personality and its influence, 8-9, 10, 23, 24-25, 41, 251-252, 266
His continual Presence contradicted by the Mass, 156-158, 316-317
in Roman Catholic art, 213-214
the Sacrament as instituted by, 153-154, 158-160, 167, 176
His Sacrifice a perfect redemption, 144, 148, 149, 152-154, 155-156, 159-160, 317
His Second Coming, 249
and the State's authority, 83
His Teaching, as reconciling liberty and law, 25-28 ; its purity, 187
Virgin-worship an offence to, 199, 211-212, 216-217, 229, 237-238
Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History, The (Ross), 151
Christ, St. Francis, and To-Day (Coulton), 114 *n.* 2, 115 *n.*
Christianity :
Christ its " enduring principle of regeneration," 8-9
fellowship of, 12
Christianity (*continued*)—
fruitfulness of, 35-36
mission of, spiritual, 4
primitive, how corrupted, 179-182
Chrysostom, St., 319
Church, the :
the Bible and, relations of, 14-20, 40, 77, 196, 292
in Middle Ages, monarchical position of, 4-5; 14, 20, 39, 46
reunion in. *See* Reunion
the State and : Patristic attitude, 83-86 ; mediaeval, 46 ; Reformation view, 64-66, 67 ; present connection, 279-280, 285
Church and Commonwealth, The (Ridding), 172 *n.*
Church History (Alzog), 118-119
Cicero, 85
Clement of Alexandria, 83, 184
Clement of Rome, 82
Clement VII., Pope, and Henry VIII.'s divorce, 72-73
Clergy, vestments of the, 184-185, 321
Cobern, C. M., 156
Coleridge, Father, 109
Coleridge, S. T., 68
Colet, Dean, 52, 53, 62, 63, 269
Collected Essays and Reviews (Law), 96
Columbus, 46, 48, 51, 54, 61
Commentary on 1 Corinthians (Robertson and Plummer), 154
Commentary on St. Luke (Plummer), 154
Commonitorium (St. Vincentius), 148, 178
Communion, Holy, 29
Christ's institution of, 153-154, 158-160, 167, 176
Christ's presence in, 156-158, 316-317
fasting before, 160 *n.* 2, 171, 310-313
" loaf " used in, 171, 319
non-partakers of, presence of, 146, 171-172, 176-177
Office of, present, 143-144, 171
possibilities of, yet untried, 170-173
primitive mode of celebration of, 319-321
Protestant agreement on doctrine of, 165-166
sacrifice of the people provided for in, 160-162
said or sung, 177
the term, 87, 142, 143, 175, 176
the XXXIX. Articles on, 144-145, 172
Communion of Saints, the, 193, 291-292
Como, Cardinal of, 93, 94-95

Conciliar Movement, failure of the, 62-63
Conference with Fisher (Laud), 165-166
Confession, auricular :
not truly Catholic, 183
Bishop Jayne on, 306-309
Confirmation : Anglican and Swedish, 295 ; Indian, 296
Confiteor, the, 200
Conscience, importance of, thirteenth-century development, 67-68
Constance, Council of, 64, 111
Constantine, 25, 84
Constantinople, fall of, 50
Constantinople, Church of, conclusions published by, 293-294
Controversial Catechism (Keenan), 131 *n.* 2
Controversial Statistics of Romanism (Brinckman), 131 *n.* 2
Convocation prayer, the, 182
Copernicus, 9, 46, 47, 51, 54, 61
Corpus Christi, Festival of, 163
Cosin, Bishop, 157 *n.* 1, 318 *n.*, 320
Coulton, G. C., controversies with Roman Catholics, 122-123, 125, 133-135, 138
Coupe, Father, 110
Coverdale, Miles, 73
Cranmer, Archbishop, 52, 59, 73, 100 ; Bible of, 76 ; Litany of, 87 ; martyrdom of, 88 ; Prayer Book of, 87-88, 143
on the Sacrament, 143, 145
on transubstantiation, 80-81, 148-149
Creeds, the :
the Apostles', 17, 29, 165
the Athanasian, 286
Christ's relation to, 30-33
the Lambeth "Appeal" on, 29, 32, 41, 277
the Nicene, 29, 30, 165, 277, 286
Pius IV.'s, 113, 114
in United Church, 29, 165, 284-285, 286
Creighton, Bishop, 63, 68
Crome, Edward, 73
Crusades, the, service of, 50, 51
Cusa, Nicholas de, 47

Dacheux, L., 131 *n.* 1
Dante's conceptions an obstacle to exploration, 48
Darwin, Charles, 51
Davidson, Archbishop, 146, 286, 313
Dead, the :
prayers for, 291-292
the resurrection of, 288-291
Dechamps, Mgr., Gratry s letter to, 135-136
Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament (Cranmer), 148
Define Your Terms (Dowden), 157 *n.* 1, 316
Devotional literature, Roman Catholic, and cultus of Virgin, 199, 204-207, 208-209
Diaconate, the, Anglican and Swedish, 295
Dibdin, Sir Lewis, 146
Dissuasive from Popery (Taylor), 300
"Divorce" question, the, and Reformation, 71-73, 92
Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion (Headlam), 166-167
Doctrine of the Church of England on the Holy Communion (Meyrick), 162 *n.* 2
Döllinger, I. von, 136-137
Donatist schism, the, 83-84
Douay Bible, the, 216, 218, 220
Dowden, Bishop :
on auricular confession, 306-307, 309
on reservation of Sacrament, 157 *n.* 1, 316
Duperron, Cardinal, 157 *n.* 1

Eastern Church, the :
reunion negotiations, and conclusions of, 292-294
standing attitude for prayer, 320
Eastward position, the, 320
Ecclesiastical Antiquities (Bingham), 314
Ecclesiastical Courts, 100
Ecclesiastical Polity (Hooker), 168
Eckhart, 10
Edward VI., legislation of, 60
Elevation of the Sacrament, the, 151 *n.* 1, 184, 316-317
Elizabeth, Queen :
assassination of, considered by Papacy, 93-98
excommunicated, 90, 91-93
influence of, on Reformation, 90, 91
Ely, Humphrey, 94
Emperor, the, as representative of God, 83-86
Encomium Moriae (Erasmus), 55-59
England :
Papal control resented by, 61-62, 63-64, 92-93
position of, altered by age of discovery, 49
Reformation conservative in, 65, 66
England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth (Meyer), 94

England, the Church of:
action and reaction in, 99-100
Anglo-Catholic movement in, 145-147, 178, 180, 210-211, 264, 299, 313-314
"Catholic," use of word in, 178
confession, auricular, in, 306, 308, 309
continuity with progress in, 41, 89-91
discipline lacking in, 197
duty of, fundamental, 261
failure of, recent, 248, 254, 267
Holy Water illegal in, 186
Lord's Table in, 185
Mass, the, attempted revival of, in, 145-147; motives of movement, 168-169; reunion and, 164-168
opportunity of, to-day, 249, 269-270
Orders of, 35, 294, 295
Orthodox Church and, 292-294
policy of, present-day, 254-257, 259-260, 261, 279-282
the Prayer Book and, 87-88
prayers for the dead in, 291-292
readjustment of views in, 262-264, 266-267
reservation of Sacrament illegally practised in, 313-314
reunion efforts of. *See* Reunion
Scriptures, the, neglected in, 196
separation from Rome, steps of, 75
Swedish Church and, 294-296
theology of, its character, 41, 89-91, 264-266
vestments in, 184-185
Virgin Mary, the, duly honoured in, 192-193, 217; unauthorised teaching on, 193-194, 195-197
English, the, compared to Hebrews, 78
English Hymnal, The, 313
English literature, individualism in, 66
Episcopacy: its antiquity, two points of view on, 248; Reformation view of, 90
Episcopate, the:
Anglican, Orthodox Church on, 293-294
Indian, 296
the Pope and, 300-301
of future United Church, 273-274, 277, 284, 285, 300
Epistles, the, no reference to the Virgin in, 221-222
Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum, 54
Erasmus, 9, 54, 60, 61, 269
Encomium Moriae (*Praise of Folly*), 55-59
Paraphrases of the New Testament, 76
Erasmus and Luther (Murray), 9-10, 59 *n.*
Errors of Romanism (Whately), 162-163, 238-239
Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry (Swete), 278
Étaples, Treaty of, 45
Eucharist, the. *See also* Communion, Holy, *and* Mass
adoration of, 144, 146, 150, 157 *n.* 1, 159, 162-163, 184, 315, 316-317
elevation of, 151 *n.* 1, 184, 316-317
the Mass doctrine of sacrifice and, 149-150, 151-152, 152-154
reservation of, 146, 313-317
the Virgin's presence in, asserted, 208
the wafer, objections to use of, in, 183, 318-319
the word, 174, 175, 176
Eucharist and Sacrifice (Burkitt), 162
Eucharistic vestments, 184-185, 321
Europe and the Faith (Belloc), 105 *n.*, 121, 123 *n.* 1
Eusebius, 16, 319
Evangelical Free Churches, Federal Council's report, 283-285
Evangelical party, the, 264, 267-268
Evenings with the Romanists (Seymour), 209
Exclusiveness, religious, 103-104, 116, 121-122
Exposition of the Creed (Pearson), 288
Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles (Browne), 149, 150
Extra-liturgical Uses of the Blessed Sacrament (Gore), 158 *n.* 1

Facetiae (Bebel), 54
Faith:
liberty and, Luther's doctrine, 9-11
reason in relation to, 12-14, 23, 40
the Rule of, 17-18, 20, 21, 22, 30, 33, 40
Faith and Folly (Vaughan), 138
Fasting Communion, 160 *n.* 2, 310-313
Fathers of the Church, the:
and priesthood of the faithful, 79
and State authority, 81-86
on vestments, 184
Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches, report of, 283-285
Fellowship in Christ the essence of Communion, 170-173
Ferdinand the Catholic, 45
Ferrers, the case of, 70
Fichte, J. G., 65
Filmer, Sir Robert, 98
Fisher, John, 165

Five Centuries of Religion (Coulton), 112 *n.* 2
Forgiveness of Sins, The (Swete), 183
Fortescue, Dr. A., 151 *n.* 1, 183
Forty-Two Articles, the, 144
Foundation of the Creed, The (Goodwin), 288
Foxe, John, 54, 88, 124
France :
  international relations in 13th century, 45
  Reformation and absolutism in, 65
  early Renaissance in, 6, 7
France, Anatole, 54
Francis of Assisi, St., 20, 99
Free Churches, the, reunion with. *See* Reunion
  attitude of Church of England to, 273-278
  report of Federal Council, 283-285
Freedom of a Christian Man, The (Luther), 9
Freeman, J. H., 124
Frere, Dr. W. H., 142 *n.* 2
Froude, J. A., 124

Gairdner, Dr. J., 53
Galli, Cardinal Tolomeo, 93, 94-95
Gaping Gulph pamphlet (Stubbe), 92
Gargantua (Rabelais), 54
Geiler, Johann, 130-131
General Assembly of Church of Scotland, 286
Genesis of the Roman Rite (Bishop), 151
Genuflections, not truly Catholic, 183
Geographical discovery, influence of, on Reformation period, 47-51, 66
Germany :
  effect of discovery of New World on, 51-52
  Reformation authoritative in, 64, 65-66
" Germany," Cambridge, 73
Gerson, Jean, 130
Gibbon, Edmund, 100, 109
Gibson, Bishop, 145, 146
Gladstone, W. E., Acton's letter to, 109
Glories of Mary, The (Liguori), 206-207
Gloucester, Bishop of, 313
God :
  direct access to, the essence of freedom, 10-11, 26-27, 78, 186, 307-308
  authority proceeding from and upheld by, 82-83, 84-85
  the Mass suggests a low conception of, 154-156
God (*continued*)—
  the Sacrament not a continual propitiation of, 144, 148, 149, 152-154, 155-156, 159-160, 317
  transcendence and immanence of, 169
  Virgin-worship and false conception of, 199-200, 211-212, 231
Good Samaritan, the parable of the, 27
Goodrich, Bishop, 90
Goodwin, Bishop Harvey, 288
Gore, Bishop, 123, 154 *n.*, 158 *n.* 1, 161, 179
Gospels, the :
  Christ and His Mother in, 217-221
  return to, mediaeval, 6-8
  spirit of, contrasted with that of mediaeval Church, 4-5
  supreme value of, 21
Gostling, Frances M., 210
Grammar of Assent, A (Newman), 38
Gratry, Father, 135-136
Greek Church, the :
  Holy Table in, 185
  reunion negotiations with, 292-294
Greek influence on Renaissance, 47
Green, J. R., 91
Gregory the Great, Pope, 85
Gregory XIII., Pope, and contemplated assassination of Elizabeth, 93-96
Gregory XVI., Pope, 206
Gregory of Tours, 232
Grosseteste, Bishop, 66

Haddan, A. W., 315
Hale, Archdeacon, 100
Hammond, Henry, 157 *n.* 1
Headlam, Dr., 166-167, 278
Hebrews, the, and the English, consonance between, 78
Hegel, G. W. F., 51, 64
Hegesippus, 18
Henry II., 314
Henry IV. of Castile, 72
Henry VII., 45
Henry VIII., 59, 92
  absolutism of, 64, 65, 70, 86; its nature, 70-71
  the divorce question, 71-73, 92
Herbert, George, 61; quoted, 237-238
Herd instincts and the individual, 36, 37
Heretics, Roman Catholic attitude towards, 113-116
Historic Faith, The (Westcott), 287, 288-289
History, the new, and tradition, 262
History of the Book of Common Prayer (Procter), 142
History of European Morals (Lecky), 8

Hobbes, Thomas, 98
Holy Catholic Church, The (Swete), 300-301
Holy Spirit, the :
in doctrine of the Mass, 156
the guidance of, 287, 292
the title of, 211
Holy Table, the, 185
Holy Water, 185-186
Hook, Dean, 150 *n.* 1, 185
Hooker, Richard, 60, 61, 89, 100 ; and doctrine of the Sacrament, 145, 157 *n.* 1, 168
Hooper, Bishop, 73
Hort, Dr. F. J. A., 59, 153 *n.* 1, 177
Host, the : adoration, elevation, reservation of, etc. *See* Eucharist
Hugh of Lincoln, 66
Hugues de St-Cher, Cardinal, 130
Hus, John, 8, 15
Hutten, Ulrich von, 54
Hyperdulia, the word, 230

Idea of God, The (Pringle-Pattison), 155
Ignatius, St., 79, 82
Illegitimacy in Roman Catholic and Protestant countries, 132, 138
Images, adoration of, 186-187
Immaculate Conception, the, 128-129, 234-237
In Sacrosancta, Bull, 113
Incarnation, the, doctrine of, 223-225, 287-288
Incense, the use of, 321-324
Index Librorum Prohibitorum, 53
India, reunion movement in, 296-297
Individualism :
Christ the teacher of, 25-28
the individual and the community, 27-28, 36
the Reformation and the spirit of, 66-70
Indulgences, 77, 123
Industrial Revolution, effects of the, 243-244, 265
Infallibility :
attractive to certain minds, 181-182, 292
Papal, 126-129 ; claimed in 1870, 14, 129
Döllinger on, 137
Gratry on, 135-136
infallibility of private judgement and, 11
results of dogma of, fatal, 109-110, 111, 112, 116, 117
Infallibility of the Church (Salmon), 39, 212
Innocent III., Pope, 5, 113
Intercessory prayer to Virgin and Saints, 193, 194, 225-229, 238
Interdict, the, 4, 14
Invocation of Saints, 193, 194, 225-229, 238
Invocation of Saints and the XXIInd Article, The (Wordsworth), 193-194
Irenaeus :
on Christ and His Mother, 219
on priesthood of the laity, 79
on the Rule of Faith, 18, 19, 31
on the State, 82, 83
Isidore of Seville, St., 85, 174
Italy, Virgin cultus in, 214, 215

Jayne, Bishop, extracts from the Charges of, 305-324
Jerome, St., 79, 289
Jesuit plots against Elizabeth, 94-95, 96-98
Jeune, Sir F. H., 146
Jewel, John, 145
Jews expelled from Spain, 45
Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae (Bull), 224
Julius II., Pope, 62
Justin Martyr, 79, 83, 314
Justinian, Code of, 25-26

Keble, Mr. and Mrs., 310
Kempten, revolt of peasants of, 45
Ken, Bishop, 61
Kingdom of God, the, its nature, 4, 5
Kitchin, Bishop, 90

Laity, the :
priesthood of, 77, 78, 79-80, 81
rights and responsibilities of, 281-282
Lambert, John, 73
Lambeth and Edinburgh (Davidson), 286
Lambeth Conference, the : (1908), 273-274, 298 ; (1920), 29, 165, 273, 274-279, 293
Appeal to all Christian People, 29-30, 41, 165, 166, 273-274, 276-277 ; results of, 278-279
on prayers for the dead, 291-292
Quadrilateral, or four points of, 165, 277
the Creed, 29, 32, 41, 165, 277
the Ministry, 29-30, 41, 165, 277
the Sacraments, 29, 33-34, 41, 165-168, 277
the Scriptures, 29, 41, 165, 277
Rome and reunion question, 297-298
Lambeth judgement, the, 319, 320

Lambeth Library, Church Registers in, 91
Langland, William, 66
Last Supper, the, Gospel narrative of, 160
Lateran Council, 308; Fourth, 113, 114; Fifth, 62-63, 64
Latimer, Bishop, 73, 88
Latin Christianity (Milman) quoted, 6
Latin Communion, the. *See* Rome, Church of
Laud, Archbishop, 145, 157 *n.* 1, 165, 300
Law, T. G., 93, 96
Law, the Jewish, 33
Lecky, W. E. H., 8
Leo X., Pope, 61, 62
Leviathan, The (Hobbes), 98
Liberty:
  Christ's Personality a renewal of, 8-9, 10
  Christ's teaching reconciles law and, 25-28, 41
  degree of, needed to-day, 3-4, 39
  God, direct access to, the essence of, 10-11, 26-27, 78, 186, 307-308
  individual originality the well-spring of, 36, 37-39
  Luther's expression of, 9, 10, 11
  mediaeval struggle for, 5-8
  order and science promoted by, 12-13, 40
  religious authority and, 11-14
  in Renaissance period, 47
  Scripture study advances, 8, 9
Liddon, Canon, 196
Life and Liberty Movement, the, 282
Life of the World to Come, The (Swete), 289, 290-291
Lightfoot, Bishop, 151
Liguori, Alphonso, 206
Litany, Cranmer's, 87
Literary censorship, Roman Catholic, 53-54, 63, 106-111, 118-119, 132-133
Littledale, Dr., 201
"Loaf," the, in Communion Office, 171, 319
Logos, the Divine, as Supreme Authority, 20, 24-25, 40-41
Lollard persecutions, 54
Lord's Supper. *See* Communion
  term used in Prayer Book of 1549, 142
Lord's Table, the, a truly Catholic term, 185
Loretto, Holy House of, 234
Louis XI., 45
Louis XII., divorce of, 71-72
Lucca, Virgin and Child of, 214
Luther, Martin, 15, 54, 60
  faith and liberty, doctrine of, 9-11, 27
  pecca fortiter, 108
  and the Reformation, 64, 65-66, 73
Lutheran Bible, the, 78
Lyell, Sir Charles, 52
Lyons, the poor men of, 7

Mabillon, Dom, 107
McNeile, Professor A. H., 155
Maitland, F. W., 98
Maitland, S. R., 124
Manichaean heresy, the, in French renaissance, 7
Manning, Cardinal, 109-110
Mapes, Walter, 66
Margaret, Queen of Scotland, divorce of, 72
Marianus de Luca, Father, 115
Mariolatry. *See* Virgin Mary, cultus of
Martyrs, the, 54, 88-89, 90
Mary, derivation of name, 209
Mary, the Virgin. *See* Virgin Mary
Mary I., Queen, 91, 97; persecutions under, 88-89, 90
Mason, Dr., 215
Mass, the. *See also* Eucharist
  Catholicity of, disputed, 147-152
  Christ's institution does not justify, 153-154, 158-160, 167, 176
  Christ's continual Presence denied by, 156-158, 316-317
  Christ's Sacrifice misrepresented by, 144, 148, 149-150, 152-154, 155-156, 159-160, 317
  God, low conception of, in, 154-156
  non-partakers present at, 146, 150, 171-172
  in Prayer Book: (1549), 87, 142, 143; (1552), 143, 146
  Reformation attitude to, 80, 81
  restoration of, movement for, its illegalities, 145-147, 164; motives for, 168-169
  Reunion movement and restoration of, 164-168
  sacrifice of the people not exacted by, 160-162
  Scripture does not authorise, 152-154, 158-160, 164, 167, 176
  superstition fostered by, 162-164
  vestments worn at, 184-185, 321
  the word, 174-177
Mass, The (Fortescue), 151 *n.* 1
Massillon, 112 *n.* 2

Materialism, modern, and its retribution, 243-246, 250-251
Maurice, F. D., 317
May, month dedicated to the Virgin, 207
Mediaevalism, mistake of, 265-266
Medici, Catherine de', 88
Mediterranean Sea, historical epoch of, 48, 49, 50, 51
Melbourne, Lord, 244
" Melito, the False," 232
Mendoza, 97
Meyer, Dr. A. O., 94
Michelis, Prof., Döllinger's letter to, 136
Middle Ages, the :
the Church's monarchical position in, 4-5, 14, 20, 39, 46
the Roman Church's intolerance in, 111-115
Milman, Dean, 6
Ministry, the, reunion question and :
Lambeth " Appeal " on, 29-30, 34-36, 41, 165, 274, 275, 276, 277-278
Federal Council's report on, 283-284
Mirandola, Pico della, 62
Missal, the Roman, 198
worship of the Virgin Mary in, 199, 200-202, 233
Mixed marriages, Roman Catholic Canon law on, 103 *n.*
Moberly, Bishop, on auricular confession, 307-308
" Modern " Anglicans, 267-269
Modern Decisions on Ritual (Talbot), 318
Moors expelled from Spain, 45
More, Sir Thomas, 54, 68-70, 81, 269
" Mother of God," title of, 223-225
" Mother, The Virgin," 212, 221
Mozley, Dr., 178-179
Munich, Archbishop of, Döllinger and, 136-137
Murray, R. H., 9-10, 59 *n.*
Mystics, Reformation, 10

National Assembly, the, 279-282
Nationalism and the Papacy, 61-62, 92-93, 98-99
New Archaeological Discoveries (Cobern), 156
New History of the Book of Common Prayer (Frere), 142 *n.* 2
New Testament, the :
Canon of, 15, 16-17
Christ's story its supreme value, 21
criticism and interpretation of, 22
Paraphrases of (Erasmus), 76-77
Virgin cultus not authorised by, 217-221, 228
New World, effect of discovery of the, 47-51, 66
Newman, Cardinal, 38
Döllinger on Cardinalate of, 136
remark of, to Pusey, 121, 122
on Roman Catholic intellectual censorship, 108-109, 116, 135
on state of Roman Catholic countries, 127
Newspapers and Roman Catholic censorship, 106
Newton, Sir Isaac, 13, 51
Nicaea, Council of, 14
Nicene Creed, the, 29, 30, 165, 277, 286
Nonconformists :
and the Lambeth Quadrilateral, 165-166, 278, 283-285
opposition to the Mass, 165
North Sea, historical epoch of, 50
Northampton, Bishop of, 124-125
Notitia Eucharistica (Scudamore), 314, 318, 319

Oblation, Prayer of, 161-162
Oecumenical Patriarchate, delegation from, 293
Old Testament, the, 21
Canon of, 16
Virgin cultus not authorised by, 216-217
On Prescription (Tertullian), 198
Optatus of Milevis, St., 83-84
Orders, Anglican, 35
Orthodox Church and, 293-294
Swedish Church and, 295
Origen :
Against Celsus, 186
on Church and State, 83
on priesthood of the laity, 79
on resurrection of the dead, 289
Origin of Species, The (Darwin), 51
Ornaments Rubric, the, 184
Orthodox Eastern Church :
Holy Table in, 185
negotiations on reunion with, 292-294
standing attitude for prayer, 320
" Our Lady," title of, 210-212
Overseas Dioceses, Reunion movement in, 274, 279, 280, 285
Oxford Conferences (Rickaby), 114
Oxford University, 73

Paget, Bishop, 146, 313
Pantagruel (Rabelais), 54
Papacy, the :
assassination condoned by, 93-98
divorce question and, 72-73

Papacy, the (*continued*)—
England throws off authority of, 75, 90-91
Episcopacy and, 300-301
a Mediterranean power, 51
nationalism opposed to, 61-62, 92-93, 98-99
political supremacy claimed by, 46, 98
power of mediaeval, 4-5, 14, 46
struggle against, outbreak of, 5-8, 15
Wyclif attacks, 59
Papal infallibility, 126-129
attracts certain minds, 181-182, 292
claimed in 1870, 14, 129
Döllinger on, 137
Gratry on, 135-136
infallibility of private judgement and, 11
results of dogma of, fatal, 109-110, 111, 112, 116, 117
Papal States, the, 61, 62
Papal succession, the, Erasmus and, 76, 77
Paraphrases of the New Testament (Erasmus), 76
Parker, Matthew, 293
Parliament under Henry VIII., 70-71
Reformation carried out by, 76
Parma, Baptistery of, 214
Parry, Dr., 94
Parsons, Robert, 97
Pascal, Blaise, 54, 98
Patriarcha (Filmer), 98
Patronage question, the, 256, 281
Paul, St. :
Luther's appeal to, 10
on resurrection of the dead, 289-290
on State's authority, 82, 83
Pearson, Bishop, 288
Peter, St., 76, 77, 222
Peterborough, Bishop of, 260
Philip II., 64, 65
Phillimore, Sir Robert, 184 *n.* 1, 316-317, 321
Philosophy, the new, and dogma, 262-263
" Physicians of souls," Roman Catholic priesthood as, 116-117, 126-127
Pius IV., Pope, 91, 92
Creed of, 113, 114
Pius V., Pope, Elizabeth excommunicated by, 90, 91-93, 94, 95, 96, 97
Pius VII., Pope, 206
Pius IX., Pope, 14, 234
Plain Reasons (Littledale), 201-202
Plummer, Dr., 153, 154
Pollard, Professor A. F., 59, 71, 88
Polycarp, 79, 82
Pope, the. *See* Papacy *and* Papal Infallibility
the Episcopate and, 300-301
Pope, Very Rev. Hugh, 121 *n.* 2
Potosi, discovery of silver of, 52-53
Praescriptio adversus Haereticos (Tertullian), 17
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges abolished, 62-63
Praise of Folly (Erasmus), 55-59
Prayer :
attitude for, 320-321
for the Dead, 291-292
the freedom of, 26-27
intercessory, 193, 194, 225-229, 238
Prayer of Oblation, the, 161-162
Prayer Book, the :
(1549), 86-88, 142, 143, 172, 175
(1552), 86-88, 143
(1662), 89, 90
doctrine of the Eucharist in, 166, 167-168
Precedents and Proceedings (Hale), 100
Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, union among, 285
Priesthood, the Roman Catholic :
controversial dishonesty of, 122-126, 133-135
in Middle Ages, 130
as " physicians of souls," 116-117, 126-127
sacrificial office of, doctrine of, 149, 150, 152, 157
Priesthood of the laity, the, 77, 78, 79-80, 81
Principia (Newton), 51
Principles of Geology (Lyell), 52
Pringle-Pattison, Dr., 155
Printing :
the invention of, effects of, 53-54
Papal control over, 63, 107
Private judgement, the right of, 10-11
Problem of Reunion, The, 298-299
Procter, Francis, 142
Protestant history, Roman Catholics on, 123, 124
Protestant Reformation, The (Cobbett), 124
Protestants :
agreement among, on Sacrament, 165-166
belief in moral accountability, 122-123, 134
Provincial Letters (Pascal), 98
Psalter of the Virgin (Bonaventura), 204-206
Psychic research, 249, 263
Psychology, the new, 263

Purgatory, etc. (Mason), 215
"Purgatory, Queen of," title of, 208-209
Puritan reaction, the, 99
Puritanism and the Reformation, 60, 64
Purity, the problem of, 258-259
Pusey, E. B., Newman's remark to, 121, 122
Putnam, Dr., 53

"Queen of Heaven," 209
"Queen of Purgatory," 208-209

Rabelais, 54
Radbert, Pascharius, 163
Readjustment of Christian thought, modern, 262-264, 266-267
Real Presence, The (Strong), 167-168
Reason as the true basis of authority, 12-14, 23, 25, 40
Reform, present-day, ecclesiastical and social, 255-261, 266
Reformation, the:
  despotism helped by, 65
  the divorce question and, 71-73
  Ecclesiastical Courts and, 100
  geographical influences and, 9, 47-53
  historical influences and, 45-47
  incense, use of, after, 322, 323
  individualism and, 66-70
  influences, general, producing, 9, 10
  leaders of, their greatness, 149
  the Martyrs and, 88-89, 90
  Mass turned into Communion by, 142
  mediaevalism, modern, cannot undo, 265-266
  moderation and sense of continuity in, 89-91
  nationalism and, 61-62, 63-66, 92-93, 98-99
  the Papal policy stimulates, 91-99
  Parliament carries out, 75
  the Prayer Book and, 86-88
  priesthood of the laity, idea of, and, 77, 78, 79-80
  printing, the invention of, and, 53-54
  satire and, 54-59
  Scripture study and, 15, 196
  State authority, conception of, and, 64-66
  translations of the Bible and, 75-78
  unity of life, conception of, and, 73-75
  Wyclif and, 8, 15, 59-61, 67, 73
Regnans in excelsis, Bull, 92, 94, 97
Relics, veneration of, 77
Religion, authority in, 11-14, 40
  Christ the Supreme Authority, 20-23
  Church and Bible, relations of, and, 14-20, 40
Religion, authority in (*continued*)—
  individual originality and, 36, 37-38
  reason the true basis of, 12-14, 23, 25
Religion of Protestants a safe Way of Salvation (Chillingworth), 15
Renaissance, the, 8, 47, 52, 53, 77
  early, in France, 6, 7
Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 1906, 146-147, 313-314
Reservation of the Eucharist, 146, 313-317
Resurrection of the dead, the, 288-291
Reunion. *See also* Lambeth Conference
  basic conditions of, 29-36, 41, 165, 274-278, 283-285, 286-287
  English Church and, 273-278
  Free Churches and, 270, 283-285
  in India, 296, 297
  Mass, the, revival of, an obstacle to, 164-168
  Orthodox Eastern Church and, 292-294
  Overseas Dominions and, 274, 279
  Roman Church, position of, and, 269-270, 297-301
  Scottish Church and, 285-286
  Swedish Church and, 294-296
Ricardo, David, 244
Richard I., 66
Rickaby, Father, 114, 122, 134-135
Ridding, Bishop, 172 *n.*, 306
Ridley, Bishop, 73, 88, 157 *n.* 1
Ritualists, the, Maurice on, 317
Robertson, Dr., 153
Roman Catholic countries, state of, 127, 128, 131-132, 138
Rome, the Church of:
  "Catholicity" of its tenets and usages disputed, 182-187
  censorship exerted by, 63, 106-111, 118-119, 125, 132-133
  Elizabeth plotted against by, 93-98
  English Church breaks from, 75, 90-91
  exclusiveness of, 103-104, 116, 121-122
  intolerance and cruelty of, mediaeval, 111-115
  loss of members by, 131
  nationalism opposed to, 61, 62, 63, 92-93
  Orthodox Eastern Church and, 293
  political supremacy claimed by, 98
  priesthood of. *See* Priesthood
  Reformation charges against, 61-63
  reunion question and position of, 269-270, 297-301
  satirical attacks on, 54-59

Rome, the Church of (*continued*)—
traditions, unwritten, claimed for, 19
Virgin cultus in. *See* Virgin Mary
Wyclif and, 59-60
Rosary, the, 207
Rousseau, J. J., 66
Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 146-147, 313-314
Rule of Faith, the, 17-18, 20, 21, 22, 30, 33, 40
Russian Church, the: Altar and Holy Table in, 185
Ryder, Father, 114 *n.* 2

Sacrament, the Blessed. *See also* Communion *and* Eucharist
Erasmus on, 58
the phrase, 313 *n.* 2
Sacraments, the Two: Lambeth "Appeal" on, 29, 33-34, 41, 165, 277
Sacraments, the Seven, 182-183
Sacrifice of the Mass, doctrine of, 148, 149-150, 151-152. *See also* Mass
not Scriptural, 152-154, 159-160, 164
Saints, the:
invocation of, 193, 194, 225-227, 238
worship of, 77
Salmon, Provost, 16, 39, 212
Salvation, the true nature of, 253
Satire and the Reformation, 54-59
Saturday as the Virgin Mary's Day, 209
Science:
the individual and advance of, 37
liberty, the spirit of, furthers, 12, 40
reason the informing spirit of, 12-14, 23
Scientific movement, 19th-century, effects of, 244-245, 262
Scotland:
National Church of, and reunion, 280
Presbyterian Churches of, reunion among, 285-286
Scriptures, the Holy:
the Canon of, 16-17
Christ the Supreme Authority of, 20-23
the Church and, relations of, 14-20, 40, 77, 196, 292
Church of England needs to study, 196
criticism and interpretation of, modern, 21-22, 40, 262, 264
inspiration of, Reformation view, 90
Reformation based on appeal to, 77-78
Roman Catholic ignorance of, 213
the standard of faith, 29, 41, 277
translations of, 75-78
Virgin cultus not authorised by, 215-222, 229-230, 233, 236
Scudamore, W. E., 314, 316, 318, 319
Second Advent, the, 249
Sega, Filippo, letter to, 94-95
Seneca, 82
Seymour, Rev. M. H., 209
Shaftesbury, Lord, 54
Shakespeare, William, quoted, 49
Ship of Fools, The (Brandt), 54, 55
Shrine and the Presence, The (Walpole), 157, 159
Silver, discovery of, in S. America, effects of, 52-53
Six Articles, Act of the, 86, 99
Sixtus IV., Pope, 205
Slave, the status of the, 25-26
Smithfield martyrs, the, 88-89, 90
Spain:
absolutism in, 65
plots against Elizabeth in, 94-95, 97, 98
Spencer, Herbert, 46, 250
Standing attitude for prayer, 320
"Star of the Sea," 209
State, the:
the authority of:
the Church and, 46, 82-86
Patristic attitude to, 81-86
the Reformation and, 64-66, 67, 81
Church and, connection of, 79, 279-280, 285
Stations of the Cross, the, 213
Stewart, Henry, 72
Stokes, Professor, 288
Strode, the case of, 70
Strong, Bishop, 167-168
Stubbe, Henry, 92-93
Stubbs, Bishop, 91, 320; on the word "Mass," 175-176
Superstition:
primitive Christianity and, 179-181
rife to-day, 181 *n.*
Roman Catholic tenets and usages foster, 162-164, 204, 214, 231-234, 238-239
Sweden, the Church of, and English Church, 294-296
Swete, Dr., 152-153, 183, 278, 289 290, 300
Switzerland:
Protestants and Roman Catholics in, 103-104
Reformation democratic in, 65, 66
Symmachus, 180 *n.*
Synagogue services, 158 *n.* 2

Taine, H. A., 47
Talbot, Chancellor, 318

Talbot, J. G., 146
Talbot, Bishop Neville, 156
Tauler, 10
Taylor, Jeremy, 145, 157 *n.* 1, 163, 300
Tertullian, 68
  on the martyrs, 88
  on priesthood of the laity, 79
  on the Rule of Faith, 17-18, 19, 31
  on truth and error, 198
  on vestments, 184
Test of Theological and Ecclesiastical Development, The (Gore), 179
Theodore, Pope, 315
Theophilus of Antioch, 83
Theory of Development, The (Mozley), 178-179
Theotokos, the title of, 223-225
Thirlby, Bishop, 90
Thirlwall, Bishop, 153
Thirty-Nine Articles, the, 144, 145; XX., 19; XXII., 186, 193-194; XXIV., 19; XXV., 183; XXVIII., 144, 162; XXXI., 144-145; XXXIV., 19, 320, 323
  doctrine of the Sacrament in, 144-145
Thoughts on Religion at the Front (Talbot), 156
Thyatira, Metropolitan of, 293
Titles given to St. Mary the Virgin, 208-212, 223-225
Torquemada, 45
Transitus, the, 232
Translations of the Bible, 75-78
Transubstantiation:
  Cranmer on, 80-81, 148
  doctrine of, 149-150, 169
  Erasmus on, 58
  Gospel story, the, and, 160
  XXXIX. Articles on, 144
Trench, Archbishop, 306
Trent, Council of, 16, 19, 113, 128, 149, 153, 172 *n.*, 174
Triumphus Veneris (Bebel), 54
Tursellinus, 234
Tyndale, William, 73
Tyrel, 93

Ultramontane historians, 123
Ultramontanes and Ultramontanism, Acton on, 96, 109
Unam Sanctam, Bull, 63
United Church, the, post-reunion, 279-282, 283
  its basic principles. *See* Lambeth Conference *and* Reunion
United Free Church, the, 286
Universities, the:
  and Henry VIII.'s divorce, 73
  theology in, present day, 263
Upsala, consecration at, 295
Usher, Archbishop, 145, 157 *n.* 1, 209, 227, 231
Utopia (More), 68, 69

Vadiscus (von Hutten), 54
Vaughan, Mgr. J. S., 138
Vestments, clerical, 184-185, 321
Vincentius of Lerins, St., 148, 178, 179
Virgin Birth, the, 287-288
Virgin Mary, the:
  Assumption of, 231-233
  Christ's relation to, 217-221
  cultus of, in Church of Rome, 77, 194, 195, 196, 197-215, 225-229
    examples of, in books of devotion, 198-208
    examples of, in works of art, 213-215
    Scripture does not justify, 196, 215-222, 228, 229-230, 233, 236
  death of, not mentioned in New Testament, 222, 232
  degrees of estimation of, in Christendom, 192-194
  Immaculate Conception of, 128-129, 234-237
  intercessory prayer to, 225-229, 237
  inventions and fables about, 229-237
  presence of, in Eucharist, asserted, 208
  titles given to, 208-212, 223
Visitation Charges (Stubbs), 175-176
Voltaire, 54
Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, 201-202
Vulgate, the, 78

Wafer, the sacramental, 183, 318-319
Waldo, Peter, 7
Walpole, Bishop, 157, 159
War, the Great, effect of, 246-248, 250
Waterland, Daniel, 145
Westcott, Bishop, 287, 288-289, 310
Whateley, Archbishop, 162-163, 238
Wilde, Oscar, 250
Williams, N. P., 264
Wordsworth, Bishop, 193-194
Wyclif, John:
  influence of, on the Reformation, 8, 15, 59-61, 67, 73
  translation of Scriptures, 76

Printed in Great Britain by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh*.

EDITED BY CANON STREETER

THE SPIRIT: GOD AND HIS RELATION TO MAN CONSIDERED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY AND ART. By A. SETH PRINGLE-PATTISON, LILY DOUGALL, J. ARTHUR HADFIELD, C. A. ANDERSON SCOTT, CYRIL W. EMMET, A. CLUTTON-BROCK and B. H. STREETER (Editor). 6th Thousand. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

THE OXFORD MAGAZINE.—"There is no doubt that the point in Christian theology that most needs attention in the present day is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This book is a fresh and stimulating treatment of some aspects of that problem. The various essays which it contains are in close touch with present-day movements of thought, and should therefore prove suggestive to a multitude of readers."

IMMORTALITY: AN ESSAY IN DISCOVERY, CO-ORDINATING SCIENTIFIC, PSYCHICAL, AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH. By BURNETT H. STREETER, A. CLUTTON-BROCK, C. W. EMMET, J. A. HADFIELD, and the Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. 5th Thousand. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

Canon BARNES in *THE CHALLENGE.*—"It is a timely contribution to an important subject. . . . I have reviewed the book at length because I feel it to be of great importance. Its writers, as I have tried to show, are able, thoughtful and wide in sympathy and understanding. The opinions which they express are manifestly those which they hold as the result of that travail of soul through which every religious teacher must pass before he can with power speak of spiritual things to his fellow-men."

FOUNDATIONS: A STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN BELIEF IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT. By Seven Oxford Men: B. H. STREETER, R. BROOK, W. H. MOBERLY, R. G. PARSONS, A. E. J. RAWLINSON, N. S. TALBOT, W. TEMPLE. 10th Thousand. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

Canon A. W. ROBINSON in *THE GUARDIAN.*—"We may be thankful for a book which is true to the best elements in the inheritance of the past, thoroughly alive to the requirements of the present, and entirely undismayed in its outlook upon the developments of the future."

EDITED BY CANON STREETER & MISS DOUGALL

CONCERNING PRAYER: ITS NATURE, ITS DIFFICULTIES, AND ITS VALUE. By the Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, HAROLD ANSON, EDWYN BEVAN, R. G. COLLINGWOOD, LEONARD HODGSON, RUFUS M. JONES, W. F. LOFTHOUSE, C. H. S. MATTHEWS, N. MICKLEM, A. C. TURNER, and B. H. STREETER. 7th Thousand. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

THE EXPOSITOR.—"The book is a rich gift to the whole Church. We have seen no work on prayer that could be named beside it."

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

EDITED BY DR. H. B. SWETE

ESSAYS ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY. By the Rev. Canon A. J. Mason, D.D., the Very Rev. J. A. Robinson, D.D., Prof. C. H. Turner, D.Litt., the Most Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D., and the Rev. Prebendary F. E. Brightman, D.D. Edited by H. B. Swete, D.D. Second and Revised Edition. Edited, with new Preface, by Professor C. H. Turner. 8vo. 15s. net.

THE GUARDIAN.—"This is almost certainly the most important book on any subject of ecclesiastical interest which has been produced in the last ten years. It must receive the fullest and most careful consideration from all students and from the Church at large. It deserves to have enormous—it may even perhaps achieve decisive—influence on religious and intellectual progress in the direction of Christian reunion, of historical study, and the knowledge of the origins of the modern world."

THE CHURCH TIMES.—"Not the least important of Dr. Swete's many gifts to the Church. . . . A work of exact scholarship tempered by breadth of view."

ESSAYS ON SOME THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Members of the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12s. net.

THE GUARDIAN.—"The volume is one which must engage the attention of all who are interested in theological speculation in English-speaking countries, for the men who have contributed chapters to it are specially qualified to judge of the direction in which religious thought is moving."

THE OUTLOOK.—"It is worthy, amply worthy, of those who stand in the succession to Lightfoot and Hort and Westcott."

ESSAYS ON SOME BIBLICAL QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Members of the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12s. net.

THE ATHENÆUM.—"This is a remarkable book, and ought to attract the attention of all who are interested in the Bible. . . . It reflects the highest credit on the University's school of theology, and places that school in the foremost rank of the theologians of the day."

THE GUARDIAN.—"The volume is one of the deepest interest. . . . It provides an admirable survey of the problems which are engaging the attention of Biblical scholars."

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., Ltd.